The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CIX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1919 No. 2833

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 511

EDITORIALS:

Mine and Thine in German Colonies 514

The Street Railway Débâcle 515

The Silver Age of Our Literature 516

BRITISH LABOR STRATEGY. By G. D. H. Cole 517

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE: Japan Astir. By J. Ingram Bryan 518

THE GHOST OF BEAUTY. By Robert P. Utter 520

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 520

CORRESPONDENCE 521

LITERATURE:

Dickens and His Friends 522

Currents of Spanish Literature 523

Sense and Sentiment 524

DRAMA: Mr. Belasco Explains. By L. L. 525

ART: The National Treatment of a National Asset. By N. N. 526

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 527

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 534

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor — HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ALBERT JAY NOCK, Associate Editors — FREDA KIRCHWEY, MABEL H. B. MUSSEY

Subscription Rates—Four dollars per annum, postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $5.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: Room 1348, People's Gas Bldg. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

THE Allies have a habit of setting themselves difficult problems, as, for instance, how to jump two ways at once, or, concretely, how to slay Bolshevism in the Baltic and yet to oust the Germans who are engaged in the same congenial work. "Loyal" Russians and the soldiers of General von der Goltz are fighting Bolsheviki and Letts. The Allies presumably must find some way of supporting the "loyal" Russians and the Letts, and of fighting Germans and Bolsheviki. It will be very difficult. The contest is at least four-cornered. Von der Goltz doubtless aims at a German Baltic; the Supreme Council supports the "natives" in the hope of a renewal of Allied control and direction; the Bolsheviki, by propaganda and arms, intend to save the Baltic for the revolution; while the ordinary "bourgeois" inhabitants of these beleaguered states doubtless are revolving on their tongues empty phrases regarding freedom and "self-determination." Meanwhile Riga has fallen to the Germans and the "loyal" Russians, Lettish troops are said to have been landed from British warships at Libau, the British have declared a blockade of Baltic ports and ordered all German ships to their home ports, and the threat of a complete blockade still hangs over the German Government.

THE number of anti-Bolshevist Russian governments continues to multiply; the armies of von der Goltz and of the Allies continue their assaults; the blockade holds so firmly that Sweden dares not send a ship to Russia for fear of Allied reprisal; and still the Soviet Government holds out. Like a terrier at bay the Bolsheviki swing on Kolchak on the east, then back at Denikin on the south, and against the Allies to the north, nipping at their Baltic enemies and the Germans wherever a head appears, standing off the Japanese in Siberia and the British in the Caucasus. The new "Northwest Government," an itinerant concern maintained here and there by the British in the Baltic, continues to rally the hopes of certain champions of autocracy, while a hopeful "West Russian Government" is reported to have opened headquarters at Berlin. This newest child of imperialism bears a strong resemblance to its less Teutonic cousins and is said to have issued a programme advocating a strong army in alliance with Admiral Kolchak and General Denikin to combat the Bolsheviki. Lately General Denikin has earned most of the attention and applause of the imperialists, while Kolchak has been placed in a less favorable light in the United States on account of the recent unpleasantness reported between him and General Graves. But General Denikin is facing certain odds. His soldiers and officers are reported to be massacring the Jews in Ekaterinoslav, Kharkov, and other towns, while even the anti-Bolshevist Ukrainian troops are rising against him on every hand, some to prevent his getting in touch with the Poles, some because of his opposition to Ukrainian national ambitions, some on account of alleged atrocities committed by his troops on peasants and women. At this opportune moment word has come of a large-scale offensive begun against Denikin by the Bolsheviki. Meanwhile, another winter has come to persuade the starving people of Central Russia of the kindly instincts of the Allied nations.

WHILE military operations, political machinations, and strikes occupy the front pages of the newspapers, here and there fundamental economic reforms are being effected to which the press gives but slight attention. The Czecho-Slovak Government, according to the Premier, M. Tusar, as reported by the correspondent of *The Daily Herald* (London), is re-distributing the land. "This," says M. Tusar, "was no act of class hatred. In order to introduce democracy, the chief obstacle had to be removed." Accordingly, though five hundred-odd landowners elected seventy out of the 243 members of the Diet, an act has been passed making it impossible for any family to own more than 1,000 acres of land. About 12,000,000 acres of woodland and 5,200,000 acres of arable land are to be divided among 430,000 small holders, laborers, and associations. It is proposed to follow this measure with another socializing the mines. Similar action is being taken in Esthonia, where sixty of the Baltic barons under the Czar owned three-fourths of the land. The constitutional assembly has just passed an agrarian bill placing under government control all the land in the country, as well as live stock, buildings, implements, and everything on the farms. The present owners are to be compensated, and farms are to be allotted to fifty thousand former soldiers, who will likewise be

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

given credit by government farm banks. Experiments like these have far greater real interest and significance than the ordinary doings of politicians and generals.

THERE is no need for supposing that Mr. Lloyd George is anything but sincere and disingenuous in urging the United States to assume the responsibility of a mandate in Armenia. It is true, as he says, that the conclusion of the treaty with Turkey hangs upon the decision of the United States regarding a mandate. It is true that the fate of Armenia hangs in perilous suspense pending the conclusion of the treaty. It is equally true that the British Government can ill afford, either in money or in men or in domestic prestige, to take on any new administrative tasks in the more remote sections of the world. The conclusion, however, that the United States must oblige the Empire by assuming, single-handed, the burden of establishing and protecting a handful of homeless, landless Armenians in a vast stretch of country largely desolate and mountainous and inhabited by hostile people is not necessarily the only conclusion to reach. Rather euphemistically, Mr. Lloyd George remarks, "We [the British] are undertaking a great civilizing duty at great cost to our country. Providence has sent this mission to our race." He is willing, however, to tempt Providence to the extent of inviting his "kith and kin" in America to share the burdens and glories of missionary endeavor. Possibly Providence, if earnestly petitioned, might let Great Britain off from some of the tasks of which Mr. Lloyd George complains; might release the 100,000 British troops from Mesopotamia, the 90,000 from Egypt and Palestine, the 60,000 from Ireland. Providence might excuse the British Government from stabilizing Persia, and from the ungrateful duty of saving India from itself. In that case, under the administration of the League of Nations that is to be, Great Britain might be able to contribute, in common with the United States and other civilized nations, enough money and men to protect the Armenian nation in a world made safe for racial minorities.

IN an even more openhanded spirit Mr. Henry Morgenthau urges the United States to take over the administration not only of Armenia, but of Anatolia and Constantinople as well. He, too, indulges in minor euphemisms. He wants established at Constantinople a great American centre from which may radiate an example of democracy to brighten the darkness of the Near East. He talks of "duties and responsibilities" and expresses himself as convinced of the sincerity of some of the "leading British statesmen" in wishing the United States to share them. But Mr. Morgenthau is provident as well as philanthropic. "Our people," he is quoted as saying, "will expect Great Britain to welcome us in the Mediterranean and the Near East as a full partner with all rights, privileges, and responsibilities. I have thought as to how Great Britain can demonstrate her willingness, and think the best way would be by her giving us an equal control of the Straits of Gibraltar." Here is a dangerous hint, the first we have received, that democracy is not to be expected to shine for nothing. Certain rights and privileges accompany the responsibilities of civilizing the world. Full partnership in the tangled politics of the Near East, a hand in the intrigue of European interests in the Mediterranean, "an equal control of the Straits of Gibraltar"—this is part of the price of democracy. Such suggestions only serve to strengthen our conviction that the United States should refuse a mandate for any part of Turkey, and should insist upon an international settlement of the problem of the Near East.

OF the flood of racial animosities loosed by the war, and augmented rather than restrained by the Peace of Versailles, none is more pathetic in its result than the wave that has broken upon the Jews. According to the Zionist Organization of America, more than 30,000 Jews have been massacred in Ukrainia alone since last November, and cable news from Paris indicates fear of increasing outrages in consequence of the differences between Denikin and Petlura. The latter has shown himself relentlessly anti-Semitic, and massacres are predicted in whatever part of White Russia he is able to assert his power. France is not a country that has been notably friendly toward the Jews, but the feeble and vacillating policy of the Supreme Council in the face of repeated outrages has led to conditions that have called forth an appeal, signed by Anatole France, Pierre Mille, Henri Barbusse, Albert Thomas, George Duhamel, Ernest Lavisse, and others, which reads in part as follows:

> In the name of human conscience, in the name of the moral responsibility of all men to their fellow men, the undersigned appeal to the people of the world, and especially to the people of France. A cry of despair and poignant sorrow comes to us from Eastern Europe: Poland, Lithuania, Ukrainia, Galicia, Rumania; an entire people appeals desperately to us for help. . . . The ambitious rivalries of governments and parties, all the sanguinary folly of civil wars, have now been let loose on the unfortunate Jewish minority with a criminal frenzy. Compared with the recent atrocities, the pogroms under the Czar, the massacre at Kishinev, were as the play of children. . . . Let all the representatives of the people in the parliaments of the world raise their voice against these bloody iniquities. The duty is incumbent upon the free peoples and the responsible governments to put an end to these monstrous violations of the rights of man. We demand the immediate organization of the committee of defence, invested with all the authority which is proper for their high mission. The millions of oppressed Jews have no other safeguard but the united moral support of the civilized world, and they have placed their highest hopes in the sacred rights of man to life and liberty.

THIS country is headed straight for a most humiliating experience in connection with the International Labor Conference which is fixed under the treaty to take place on October 29. It is extremely doubtful whether the treaty will be ratified by that time by the requisite three Powers; even if it has been so ratified there will be no American governmental representatives present, so that the conference will meet in a country which will itself be unrepresented in the gathering. Again, there is growing protest at the failure to extend full privileges to the late enemy states. The Germans and Austrians are not going to send representatives on the chance of their being admitted. They decline "to sit in the ante-chamber while Chinese, Cuban, and South American delegates are passing in and then to risk admittance being refused to them." The *Vorwärts* (Berlin) declares that "it is impossible for Germany to submit to this humiliation." What is more important, are the reports from Denmark and from Holland that the delegates of those countries will not take part in this conference unless the Germans and Austrians are given exactly the same rights and privileges as all the other delegates. As that cannot be done now in view of the German

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stand, it looks as if two important neutrals would be absent. The position of Switzerland is also reported to be dubious. It all bids fair to be a pitiful fiasco, for Secretary of Labor Wilson himself suggests that it may be necessary for the conference, as soon as it has come together, to adjourn indefinitely, awaiting ratification. This is a pleasant prospect for the delegates who are coming from all over the world.

IT is hard to believe that the great capitalists and managers of industry really understand conditions among the workers of this country, or they would scarcely continue to play with dynamite as they are doing. They ought to listen to Samuel Gompers, for they have no more genuine friend and servitor than he. "We demand," he says, "a voice in the determination of the conditions under which we will give service. . . . We have never made an assault—and it is furthest from our thoughts—upon the rights of property or the rights of management; no revolution for Mr. Gompers, not even an unkind look at the present God-given industrial order—but if the employers break the steel strike, says Mr. Gompers, and men go about preaching "the tyranny which they experience and the injustices which have been meted out to them, then, whatever betide, you have sown the seed and will bear the consequence." We are not often able to agree with Mr. Gompers, but we do unreservedly commend his warning to that large body of American employers who appear to believe that we are still living in the middle of the nineteenth century. The words we have quoted should carry the more weight in such quarters because there is nowhere to be found a more sincere and consistent supporter of the old capitalistic order than the president of the American Federation of Labor.

WHEN peaceable citizens marching through the streets of the city, with or without a permit, are charged by mounted policemen and beaten with clubs; when men, women, and small children are left trampled and cut and bruised; when the victims of the assault are arrested, held without bail, tried—without the chance of an appeal to a jury, and sentenced to six months for "disorderly conduct"—when these things happen in New York city, honest citizens feel some horrid doubts about our democracy. Such events as occurred last Wednesday in lower Fifth Avenue and subsequently in court before Magistrate Sweetser recall the darkest days of the old Russia. The story of peaceable assemblages brutally assaulted by Cossacks, of summary trials and swift imprisonment, was doubtless of recent and awful memory to most of the marchers. To be sure, the Russian masses had nothing to say about the laws which they violated; nor any valid Constitution to protect their civil rights. But the distinction is one without a difference. The charge of "disorderly conduct" is a blanket charge which a magistrate may apply to any sort of behavior that happens to displease him; and as for constitutional guarantees, Judge Sweetser is quoted as having told the paraders haled before his desk that the Constitution was not meant for "foreign Russians." Any magistrate who said anything that could even be interpreted as implying such an idea should be summarily removed from the bench. If America offers this sort of freedom to the strangers within its gates, the Statue of Liberty in New York harbor should lower her torch as each shipful of immigrants unloads at Ellis Island. No wonder the "offenders" at the bar asked to be sent back to their native land.

THE treatment by the police of the Finnish steel workers at Weirton is a parallel incident showing that the spirit of official lawlessness is not localized. The 150 men forced to kiss an American flag and then driven out of town for the alleged crime of belonging to a radical labor organization left some 700 women and children destitute and without protection. Perhaps the most sinister feature of the incident was the explanation given by the local authorities and the press. Without attempting to deny the action of the police, the story was given out that the deported men were members of the I. W. W. While we have reason to doubt the correctness of this charge, its use in any case as a defence of lawlessness is grimly amusing. It is almost time for the public and the authorities, both local and federal, to realize that every man or woman, church-member or atheist, Republican or I. W. W., philanthropist or thief, has certain rights once called inalienable. Among these are the right of *habeas corpus*, the right of free speech, press, and assemblage, the right "to be secure in their persons, homes, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures," the right of every person within the jurisdiction of a state to "the equal protection of the laws," and the right of anyone accused of a crime to "a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the state and district wherein the crime shall have been committed." As far as we know, it has not yet been held a crime to belong to the I. W. W., nor even to be a Finn or a Russian; but if our foreign-born workers can secure even the rights guaranteed to criminals under the Constitution, their present status will be much improved.

IT is bad enough for those valuable citizens who never know what to think of the news until their favorite journal has pronounced upon it that the pressmen's strike delays the publication of so many journals; but there are other readers who deserve even more sympathy—those who were engrossed in some serial story or other when the strife broke out and who are now hanging in agony upon the event. Suppose you left the hero helpless, bound hand and foot, while the German spy had just slipped out into the inky blackness with the secret documents. Or suppose you left the heroine in a position so compromising as only *The Cosmopolitan* dares get her into with any hope that she will emerge *intacta* when the December number comes out on the first of November. Or suppose the immovable president of the trust had just brought his fist down on the table with a crash as he roared out his defiance to the irresistible leader of the strikers. It was bad enough to wait in the old days of confident expectation, but now there will be heartburnings and suspicions. We cannot ask too much of human nature. Here and there will be found readers unpatriotic enough after a long interval not to care whether the inky blackness ever yields up its German spy again. There may be those who will feel skeptical of the power of even the American girl to withstand the wiles of the *Cosmopolitan* Comus indefinitely if the rescuers do not arrive. And, most dreadful thought of all, conceivably readers will be found so unorthodox to the dogma of the class struggle that when time enough has elapsed they will wonder whether the deadlock between immovable capital and irresistible labor is really necessary or fruitful.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mine and Thine in German Colonies

AT the first meeting of the League of Nations one point in the order of business can be disposed of at once: the former colonies of Germany. They were "allocated" long ago by secret agreements among the conquerors. All that remains is for the Council of the League of Nations to make the formal gesture of handing out the mandates in accordance with Article 22 of the covenant, as "previously agreed upon by the members of the League."

Some of us had been under the impression that it was for the League of Nations and not the Paris Peace Conference to discuss who the mandatories were to be, that it remained for the League of Nations and not the Big Three at Paris to determine questions of sovereignty in the interest of the populations concerned. Mr. Snow, in his illuminating article elsewhere in this issue, points out our error. He quotes the official statement issued on May 7 by the Council of Three at Paris covering their action on May 6, 1919, as to "the disposition to be made of the former German colonies." It was this disposition which the sacred covenant had in mind in Article 22. It was this colonial bargain, in advance of the meeting of the League of Nations, that bound Germany (and all other nations) in Article 118 of the treaty "to conform to the measures which may be taken now or in the future by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers" to carry out Germany's renunciation of "all rights and titles" to territory outside Germany. It is, therefore, the Peace Conference at Paris and not the League of Nations that determines who the mandatories shall be, as also "the degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the mandatory."

The last outstanding question connected with the naming of mandatories seems to have been settled a few weeks ago, toward the end of August, when the Supreme Council at Paris expressed its "approval" of the agreement between Great Britain and Belgium as to the disposition of the districts of Ruanda and Urundi in the northwestern part of German East Africa. Belgian forces had helped Great Britain subdue German East Africa. Their aid had been characterized by the British as "loyal, unrestricted, and of the highest value." They had even taken Tabora, the war capital of the German colony; and "when Tabora was handed over to Belgium's great British ally," this "disinterested act" was described by the Belgians as "an act which tried the pride of the victorious regiments." But Ruanda and Urundi were permitted to remain under Belgian administration for the three years that have elapsed since their conquest; and it was taken for granted by Belgium that "these provinces which have witnessed the sacrifice of so many of her sons" would remain in her possession "by right of conquest."

The official statement concerning the action of May 6 by the Big Three—Clemenceau, Wilson, and Lloyd George—overlooked the "rights" of Belgium, despite the statement of M. Hymans that "assurances were given him that those rights would be safeguarded." The Belgian peace delegation issued the statement that Belgium had "a right which she could not allow to be disposed of by agreements to which she has not been a party." Thereupon M. Hymans was "requested to call upon President Wilson," and Lord Milner summoned to Paris. "An amicable agreement was reached."

But our own Mr. Frank Polk, having taken the place of the President and Mr. Lansing at Paris, was dissatisfied with this amicable agreement. He did not seem to take much stock in the Belgian declarations that "at the close of 1918, thousands of natives covered distances often necessitating several days' journey in order to express to the representative of Belgium their gratitude, their attachment, their devotion, and their sincere desire to become Belgians." Mr. Polk, remembering perhaps the "Red Rubber" administration of the Congo, seems to have credited the reports of some missionaries that "the population of those territories were opposed to being placed under Belgian domination." Signor Tittoni, however, and M. Clemenceau argued vigorously for the ratification of the British-Belgian agreement. "This induced Mr. Polk to give way, but under reservations, till the arrival of new instructions from Washington." What these were we are not permitted to know. But on August 26, several days after Mr. Polk's passage-at-arms in the Supreme Council, two letters were read by M. van den Heuvel before the Belgian Senate, "the first giving Great Britain's confirmation of the agreement between Great Britain and Belgium concerning the German colonies, and the second expressing the approval of the Supreme Council of the League of Nations" *(sic!)*.

What had happened? Only this: In order to remove all legalistic objections to the agreement, Great Britain had made a "free gift" of the provinces. "Ruanda and Urundi, which constitute the most fertile position of the colony and which have a population of over 3,000,000 natives, have been handed over to Belgium as a gift. This gift to Belgium is a mark of British gratitude to her ally, Great Britain having been under no obligation whatever to cede this, the most valuable of her new East African domain, to Belgium or any other country." This statement being a bit too bald, a later British statement makes it out to be "a gift not to Belgium but to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, from whom Great Britain derives her right to be the future mandatory for German East Africa. . . . As yet, no Power actually holds a mandate from the League of Nations, but as the Principal Allied and Associated Powers who sanctioned the transfer of the territory to Belgium will also be the controlling force in the Council of the League of Nations, there can be no question that Belgium will receive the mandate."

This "gift" was made by one Power of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, despite the fact that Article 119 of the treaty with Germany makes all of them joint owners of all Germany's "rights and titles over her oversea possessions." The United States is one of the Powers in whom these titles are vested. But before our Senate has consented that they be taken over by us, our diplomatic representatives acquiesce in a "gift" made by one of the joint owners to some other Power, or to the League itself. We concur heartily in Mr. Snow's suggestion that the Senate consider this situation most carefully and, if the treaty be ratified at all, make a reservation "which shall do justice to the United States and to all concerned."

We regret we cannot follow Mr. Snow in some of the motives and purposes of his proposed reservation. He contends that Japan and New Zealand have received as mandatories

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those Pacific colonies of Germany which, for various reasons, should be under the control of the United States. But we want a mandate for none of these colonies, just as we are opposed to having them turned over to Japan or New Zealand. We condemn American colonial imperialism with the same zeal and for the same reasons as that of Great Britain or Japan or France, and, let us add, of Imperial Germany, the rigors of whose colonial policy must not be passed over lightly. Our view is that all "colonies," not those of Imperial Germany alone, should be brought under the control of a genuine League of Peoples; that they should be administered primarily for the benefit of the native populations; and that their raw materials should be supplied, under international control and supervision, to the peoples of the world, not as today in accordance with their ability to pay, but in accordance with their needs as members of the human family.

The Street Railway Débâcle

SAYS *The Detroit Journal:* "Once there was a town that had no street railway troubles. It had no street railway." The troubles have not all been on the side of the towns, as was shown at the meeting of the American Electric Railway Association just ended at Atlantic City. In suggesting the appointment of a Federal commission of investigation last May, Secretaries Redfield and Wilson pointed out that fifty or more systems were already bankrupt, the cities affected including New York, St. Louis, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Providence, New Orleans, Birmingham, Memphis, Chattanooga, Fort Wayne, St. Paul, Denver, and Spokane. In the course of the hearings held by the commission, it has been discovered that sixty-two electric railways with 5,912 miles of track are already in the hands of receivers; that sixty railways with 763 miles of track have been dismantled and junked; and that thirty-eight railways have been forced to abandon 257 miles of track. The bankrupt New York surface systems are being broken up into their constituent parts, and the receiver announced to the listening street railway men at Atlantic City: "When the financial burdens under which we are laboring reach the point where we cannot maintain a reserve—which will be in about ninety days—I am going to ask the court to stop the running of cars."

What are the causes of the well-nigh universal failure? The superficial ones are not far to seek. The companies, operating generally on the basis of a five-cent fare as fixed by franchise, have had to meet enormously increased costs of labor and materials, higher taxes, and rising interest rates. The competition of jitneys on the more profitable runs, and of private automobiles everywhere, has often cut sharply into earnings. In Bridgeport, for example, while the cars have been carrying less than 15,000,000 passengers, the jitneys have taken care of almost 19,000,000. In consequence of these immediate causes traction bonds, according to Roger W. Babson, have, during the past five years, shrunk in value by twenty-five per cent., and traction stocks by no less than seventy-five per cent.

The proposals made by the street railway executives before the commission unfortunately give little promise of meeting the situation. The suggestions fall into four groups. They include: an increase of fares, either by the raising of the flat rate or by the introduction of zone systems; the employment of the principle of service at cost, which has resulted in a raising of fares on the Boston Elevated, for example, three times within a year; State subsidy to private companies; and economies of operation, such as the one-man safety car, already in use in more than one hundred cities.

But none of these devices and suggestions go to the root of the difficulties leading to the present disastrous situation, in which public purchase of the lines has been strongly urged by many of the street railway men themselves. The furnishing of the public service of street-car transportation for private profit contains in itself fatal contradictions. The enterprising men who introduced street-car transportation all over the country performed an enormous public service; but the possible profits under favorable conditions were so large that exploiting financiers seized the opportunity to load down the systems of large cities like New York and Chicago with an enormous mass of securities. The monopoly character of the industry made impossible the benefits of competition; the conflict between service and profits was therefore sharp and direct. Mr. Yerkes taught us that "the profit is in the straps." Then came public regulation, with all its strangling limitations, imposed on companies in many cases already water-logged. The fat years once passed, the companies faced automobile competition, rising prices, a fixed fare, and a public opinion none too friendly. We have, apparently, reached the end of the road. Whither shall we turn?

The course indicated by experience was pointed out by Mr. Delos F. Wilcox, one of our leading traction experts, in his testimony before the Federal commission. First, he declares that the investment in street railways must be made non-speculative; capital must be brought in, not by the hope of large but uncertain dividends, but by the certainty of a low but guaranteed return. Second, the business must be run for service and not for profits; fares, for example, should be fixed on the basis of what is best for the community and not necessarily of what will make the service most profitable or even most nearly self-supporting. As a condition of such liberty of action, Mr. Wilcox insists that operation must be public and not private—and this despite the manifest weaknesses of municipal management under existing American political conditions. Fourth, says Mr. Wilcox, continuous operation must be insured, and strikes made impossible—by the public fixing of wages, hours, and conditions of work. Will this particular measure prevent strikes? In this connection we may note the action of the street railway employees of Oakland, California, and the American Labor party of New York, each group favoring the application of the Plumb plan to its transit situation.

The street railway business must be put into the hands of men who will understand that they are providing a public utility. An economical and flexible service must be assured —and here the Plumb plan has much of suggestiveness. As much or as little must be charged for the service as the public interest may require; and if it seems wise to incur a deficit, it must be met out of taxes. Transportation under modern conditions is a public utility in the broadest sense. We must learn to treat it as such.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Silver Age of Our Literature

THE death on October 7 of Mr. Henry Mills Alden, for fifty years editor of *Harper's Magazine*, removes from the journalistic profession in America one of its least conspicuous and yet most influential figures. Mr. Alden had the modesty, amounting almost to anonymity, of those editors who are content with the fame which comes to their magazines, of those workmen to whom good workmanship is in itself an end, of those friends of a cause who are satisfied when the cause prospers. In this he was much like Wendell Phillips Garrison, for so many years editor of *The Nation*. As untaught in the arts of sparing as of advertising himself, Mr. Alden read all the manuscripts submitted to the magazine, and to an eminent degree gave it unity of taste and tone. That during his entire editorial career he depended first upon George William Curtis and then upon William Dean Howells to stand beside him, if not a little before him, in the public's knowledge, is a fact which illustrates no less his modesty than his taste. For like both of them he was gentle, firm, decent in language, careful of form, high-minded, clear-sighted—always at once the citizen and the man of letters. Even *The Atlantic Monthly*, the rival in Boston and by seven years the junior of *Harper's*, has been less steady and uniform. The list of authors whom Mr. Alden discovered and encouraged is a long one, but everywhere on the list appear the qualities of good art and civil realism which have habitually marked the course of the magazine. Indeed, it might well be said that as Mr. Howells was long our more or less official exponent of realism, nearly an academy in himself, *Harper's* was long the principal organ of that doctrine, with Mr. Alden the editor who did most, even more than Mr. Howells or *The Atlantic*, to foster it and make it widely heard of. And as a preference for realism in fiction is of course but one symptom of the character of *Harper's* under Mr. Alden's direction, the excellence of its engravings and the wide and informing range of its general contributions are to have been expected to complete the picture.

To what is due the fact, which can hardly be denied, that the great older magazines no longer dominate the fields of journalism and literature in the United States as they once did? Many answers may be given, and all have been given by observers of varying predilections: that the tide of proletarian vulgarity has risen; that the levels of art have fallen; that public taste demands more violent stimulants; that the non-English elements of our national composition are asserting themselves as never before; that a sharpèr critical temper has invaded the atmosphere; that the Bolsheviki are among us, red and raging; that our democracy has just begun to live. Each of these is but explanation from one angle. Speaking as historians, we see in that shift of leadership the end of an epoch, the period from about 1870 to 1910 which we may call the Silver Age of our literature.

It is no essential contradiction of that title that during the era there throve such glorious barbarians as Whitman and Mark Twain; they came from a class and a region which flowered later than the Shantung of our nation, the New England of the image-breaking Emerson, the philosophical hired man Thoreau, the transcendental critic and artist Hawthorne, the fighting Quaker Whittier, the many-tongued translator Longfellow, the jolly Cantabrigian Lowell, the festive Bostonian Holmes. Nor is it a contradiction that at the end of the century came such a rollicking *philosophe* as William James or such a silken ironist as George Santayana, or such naturalistic young men as Stephen Crane and Frank Norris and Jack London, or such a multitudinous cynic and sentimentalist as O. Henry; or even that during the era lived those three terrible infants of the Adams family, Charles Francis II, Henry, and Brooks, to flay the era and all its inherited conceptions. The background and the prevailing color of the age were still silver. It was then that reminiscence began to enrich the texture of our literary past. Most of the epigones—Thomas Wentworth Higginson and Frank B. Sanborn, for instance—devoted a good part of their lives to writing about the lives of the protagonists. Holmes, of the greater line, wrote memoirs of Emerson and Motley; Mr. Howells, later but greater too, gave us dozens of precious memorial essays. Our classics settled into comfortable positions to wait till some revolution should spill them out. Washington as chief national hero gave way to Lincoln, whom the Silver Age softened and sweetened until his angularities hardly showed. The old flaming ardors about manifest destiny considerably cooled, not so much because the national humility was stronger, but because there was a stronger sense of decorum current. Poetry was dainty and smooth and rounded as never before in this country. The short story after many experiments straitened itself to a few prevailing types of a distinctly native form and substance. The novel, with Mr. Howells as choragus, even subdued Mark Twain from the extravagance of his earlier burlesques to the suaver annals of Huckleberry Finn and Joan of Arc; and it taught the drama that reality had a place on the stage as well as in books. Our essayists grew lighter and gayer, not without a good deal of orthodoxy and a gusto which somehow seemed to have been trained upon sweet cider, but still mellow and kindly and urbane. After the faun Thoreau, the sage John Burroughs! Scholarship grew to Alexandrian proportions; dissertations showed their heads. At the best, these silver qualities all tended towards art; at the worst they bred dilettanteism and languor.

Now such unaccustomed qualities as dilettanteism and languor in the midst of a nation which had plunged into furious industrial competition and was beginning to cherish imperialistic schemes without quite realizing what it was about, hardly belonged to the setting. In the Silver Age this discrepancy had seemed not to matter very greatly, for the reason that the opinion of the day held that after all a fairly decisive cleavage exists between art and affairs. The trouble began when a more strenuous generation arose and demanded that literature perform a larger, or at any rate a different, share in the national work. It was a hot and impatient generation, and not tolerant of its elders. It has taken it upon itself to damn the gentle tradition by calling it genteel. It suspects it of lukewarmness, accuses it of prudery, and believes it to have been verbose and trivial. The older magazines were essentially the children of that Silver Age which is now under indictment. The question seems to be whether they can renounce their old virtues, now become sins, and acquire the new virtues, which certainly would have been sins in their proper day.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Labor Strategy

By G. D. H. COLE

IT is not easy to form a correct estimate of the strength and orientation of the labor movement in Great Britain. It all depends where and how you look. There are reactionary streaks in British labor hardly paralleled elsewhere unless in the United States; but there is also a strong and growing leftward movement which may at any time sweep along with it a big proportion of organized labor. Viewed as a whole, the British labor movement seems about the most chaotically organized in the world; but in this chaos there are great groups and industries which are effectively united in practically blackleg-proof combinations. If the extreme left is only a small minority, so is the extreme right; and, while British labor is not "class-conscious" in any full sense, it is certainly still less conscious of any unity with the capitalist system, such as a few of its own leaders and most of the press set out to preach.

American observers, perhaps owing to a deep consciousness of their own troubles, have been apt in recent years to appraise British labor at too high a value. They have taken for accomplished facts what are only tendencies struggling to overcome opposition and inertia, and some of their estimates of leading personalities in our movement seem to us in Great Britain almost ludicrously exaggerated. In particular, they have almost fallen over one another in acclaiming "Labor and the New Social Order," the pamphlet which Mr. Sidney Webb drafted as a statement of the policy of the reorganized Labor party, whereas the left wing here has, to say the least, not got very excited over the latest exposition of Fabianism in politics.

Greatly as the Labor party has strengthened its political position since its reorganization, the developments which really count for most have taken place in the industrial sphere. The war resulted in a huge increase not only in the membership but also in the strength of trade unionism. It also gave an impetus to new ideas and better organization which is only now beginning to make itself felt. Amalgamation of rival and overlapping unions and an approximation to the "industrial" structure are slow in coming; but gradually the movement in that direction is taking shape, and important amalgamations, impossible during the war, are entering into the sphere of practical industrial politics.

The mere amalgamation of trade unions, however, though it helps to provide a better instrument for carrying on the struggle, is far less significant than the growing change in trade-union orientation. Before the war, the idea of workers' control in industry was struggling against huge odds. It was advocated by a few unions, by the few scattered organizations of industrial unionists, and by the then wholly unorganized but influential group of guild socialists. Apart from these, it was opposed by the trade-union leaders and ignored by the most of the rank and file. The idea was still in the early stages of propagandist activity, and had certainly not reached the stage of formulation as a definite programme by responsible labor bodies.

The war has changed all that. Several of the largest and most important unions, including the Miners' Federation, the National Union of Railwaymen and the other two railway unions, the principal societies in the post office, and others, have formulated definite proposals for the assumption of control jointly with the state as owner, while in other industries, such as engineering, shipbuilding and building, the control idea has made enormous headway, although no concrete proposals for a complete system of control have yet been officially put forward. The "rank and file" organizations of the district councils among the railway men, and of the shop stewards' and workers' committees among the engineers and kindred workers, have been the most active unofficial agencies in pressing forward the control idea.

The strategy of the class struggle in Great Britain centres largely round this question of industrial control. The capitalist system in industry is manifestly breaking up, and it is becoming more and more difficult for the capitalist employer to ensure either continuous operation of his works, or efficiency (ever the capitalist standard) even when his works are running. This is because he finds his workers decreasingly willing to go on working for profit, or to exert themselves in order to pile up profits under anti-social conditions. Great Britain is therefore confronted with the same problem which is troubling the greater part of Europe —the fact of decreasing production as a factor making for unrest, high prices, and perhaps finally revolution.

There can be no doubt that this danger is understood in capitalist circles, and that all manner of schemes are being discussed whereby the workers may be induced to coöperate in increasing production and the capitalist class may at the same time retain all its control over industry and the social power dependent upon industry. The Whitley scheme, or rather the manner in which it was taken up by the Government, was the first definite attempt in this direction; although it has manifestly failed to achieve any substantial results, or to enlist the support of the main body of labor, it is still assiduously pushed in capitalist circles—for example, by Mr. Lloyd George in his last speech to the House of Commons on the Government's industrial policy. Similar "sprats to catch mackerel" are being thrown out in other directions by those whose object it is to maintain at all costs the old industrial system.

Despite these attempts, and despite all the talk about unity, there can be no doubt that the two parties in industry are getting steadily further apart. In almost every industry there is the possibility of an explosion, and in many of them actual explosions are now prevented only by the unfavorable condition of the labor market. This does not mean, of course, that the British trade unions have one and all determined to end capitalism—still less that they have formed a concerted plan with this end of view. The discontent is still primarily with particular abuses and only secondly with capitalism itself; and a concerted plan of action is almost entirely lacking. There are present only the elements which may later be worked up into a coherent attack upon capitalism; at present they only make the capitalistic system of production work more and more inefficiently without providing a better system to take its place.

Moreover, generally speaking, each industry, and sometimes each separate craft, goes its own way largely disregardful of the rest. Except for the Triple Alliance of Miners, Railwaymen, and Transport Workers, there is hardly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any attempt at combined action. The Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, the only body which professes to represent the industrial movement as a whole, steadily eschews industrial disputes and industrial action, and takes great care to avoid responsibility and indeed decisive action of every sort. The industrial movement is, indeed, too largely leaderless and uncoördinated, and the Trades Union Congress remains a mere debating society, with more than a suggestion of the beanfeast about it. It neither acts nor organizes nor undertakes propaganda; the only form of action at which it excels is obstruction.

Accordingly, there is always a strong temptation for the "rank and file" left-wing trade unionist in Great Britain to kick over the traces, denounce the existing unions and combinations as useless, and set out to create new bodies or unofficial bodies side by side with the old. Nevertheless, it is safe to say that attempts to create new unions on a class basis are entirely futile, and that unofficial organizations can succeed only as temporary bodies influencing the existing unions. The I. W. W. is and will remain negligible in Great Britain. The Socialist Labor party, which once tried to promote the One Big Union as a rival to existing unions, has abandoned the attempt, and now contents itself with stimulating and permeating such movements as that of the shop stewards. If the main body of British labor is chaotically organized and is lacking in constructive ideas for a grand assault on capitalism, it is none the less stably organized and incapable of being broken or superseded. It may possibly be led gradually leftward, and made to develop a greater class consciousness and a more definite plan; but short cuts which aim at arriving at the ideal by substituting one organization for another are doomed to failure from the outset.

This fact affects not only the industrial but also the political movement. The Labor party is based upon the trade unions, and separate political and socialist organization plays in it only a small part. The British Labor party is often denounced as a hybrid, neither fish, flesh, nor fowl; but, whatever it is, it derives from its trade-union basis a stability second only to that of the trade unions themselves. The left wing may and does grumble justly at the slackness and lack of ideas of the Labor party in Parliament; but it is not likely to succeed in launching successfully a better party. The relation of political and industrial labor in Great Britain is a clear case of the dominance of economic over political organization under capitalist conditions.

These facts also determine the international attitude of British Labor. As an effective force, the British Labor movement can make itself felt internationally only through the Labor party and the Trades Union Congress. Many will hold that this is tantamount to not making itself effectively felt at all; but it is at least clear that there is no other way. Even though the Second International is unsatisfactory, British labor is not in the least likely to join the Third. It will only, as the leftward tendency in the British movement grows stronger, begin to push the Second International itself to the left.

In fact, the orientation of British labor as a whole depends finally upon the attitude of the big unions which form the basis of its organization. The only way of moving British labor to the left is by moving these organizations, and the only way of moving them is by securing from within the adoption of more radical programmes of industrial control. The emergence of the demand for control into a clear practical issue for the miners and, to a less extent, for the railway men has done more to push them leftwards than any issue not directly affecting their own industry could have done. British labor is learning the strategy of the class-struggle as a whole only by learning it first in its particular relation to each industry. When this lesson has gone home to the workers in most of the vital industries, a coherent plan will begin to emerge, and a real leftward movement will be possible for labor as a whole.

Foreign Correspondence

Japan Astir

Tokio, July 8

THE enthusiasm over the signing of the treaty of peace has been rather formal and official than popular and profound, for the people of Japan have had little to do with the war, and have for the most part failed to appreciate either its purpose, its significance, or its outcome. This is not singular in Japan, where foreign relations are regarded as purely official matters. It may be that officialdom considers the commonalty incapable of apprehending the significance of the nation's foreign relations even if they were explained, or it may be that the truth might only encourage "dangerous" thoughts, which may be interpreted to mean a demand for the democratic institutions of the West to replace an unpopular bureaucracy. At any rate, the people of Japan know only that the nation's arms have been victorious and that Japan is one of the five Great Powers of the world, with her right hand on North China and her left palm on the islands of the South Seas.

Yet even in Japan, without any encouragement from official quarters, there is some growing realization of the new conditions created by the war. People are beginning to see that those western principles of politics and government that Japan has seen fit to imitate chiefly have been discredited and overthrown by the war. The training and organization of the Japanese army, the tenor and trend of officialdom generally, and the nation's educational system, as well as the Japanese constitution, have all been based on the German system. When the war broke out things German were in the ascendant in Japan. This left the military class and its officialdom adverse to seeing their theories and labors discounted by the victory of the Allies. But the truth must now be realized and admitted. Naturally, there is great hesitation to do so, at least publicly. In Europe throughout the war years the civilians have shown themselves more than a match for the militarists. It is, therefore, too much to expect that Japan shall shout herself hoarse in celebrating discomfiture of her own logic and the theories on which she has been building for the past forty years.

Not only has the German system, on which Japan has been building, been completely destroyed, but the balance of power, in which she sought protection from Anglo-Saxon domination, has been wholly removed by the elimination of Germany and Russia as forces that could be played off against aggressors. The vernacular press now asserts that Japan stands between England and America, at the mercy of both, and that she can thrive only in coöperation with them. The League of Nations and the treaty of peace are regarded as giving the Anglo-Saxon nations the whip hand in interna-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional affairs and Japan must consider herself in subserviency to these nations. This she is willing to do so long as they do not obstruct her policy in East Asia; for Japan is an expert in jujitsu and knows how to yield in order to overcome. But what if the Anglo-Saxons should suddenly decide to save China as they did Belgium and France? These English-speaking races are very impetuous, and easily carried away by their moral feelings; and if they should once get it into their heads that China was being outraged or Korea tortured, they might be sentimental enough to proclaim a crusade against the tormentor as they did against the Teutons. Then Japan would be undone as readily as was Germany, or even more so. So long as Russia and Germany could be counted on to appeal to there was some hope of liberty for oriental policy, but now the whole future depends on British and American sympathy, a very uncertain hope in view of the religious and moral scruples of these peoples once popular ire is ablaze.

How to view the League of Nations covenant is the most puzzling problem Japan has to face. It has to be considered mainly in its ultimate bearing on Japan's policy of pursuing a Monroe Doctrine for East Asia. The gravest doubt is in regard to how the Anglo-Saxons will interpret the covenant. Already their interpretations of it have been somewhat erratic. The covenant calls for recognition of the right of small nations and weaker races to self-determination, but there is no knowing what exceptions may be arbitrarily introduced. Already China has been made an exception, as is instanced by transferring the Chinese territory of Shantung to Japan against the will of China; and, although it is just what Japan desired, it, nevertheless, leaves the Japanese mind in a muddle as to what principle governs the interpretation of the League of Nations covenant. Who is to say that the same nations that make exceptions of helpless races and countries may not at any moment cancel these exceptions? Then where would Japan's policy be?

Japan has been accorded the position of mandatory to the Marshall and the Caroline Islands, which she took from Germany; but she has to administer them under a divided authority, one in Tokio and the other in the Supreme Council of the League of Nations at Geneva, to which she has even to submit an annual report of her doings. She has to run a losing trade at her own expense, and has no redress save in abandoning the islands. She has had her hands full in trying to maintain a peaceful administration of Formosa and Korea, which she annexed, and if the League of Nations should require a more humane administration in the South Sea Islands than has marked the progress of Japan's rule in her other newly acquired territories, there is certain to be trouble and misunderstanding all round. Even now there is a powerful volume of public opinion in America and Australia opposed to Japan's presence in the South Seas, and the grant of the mandate to Japan will but tend to add fuel to the fire. The Americans are believed to be keeping a close eye on Japan's movements in China and Siberia; and the American fleet on the Pacific has been increased to a strength rivalling that of Japan's total naval defences. No wonder Japan is much puzzled, and in spite of numerous conferences between elder statesmen and privy councillors and all the wise men that Japan can summon, there appears no solution to the problem. The League of Nations, like an All-seeing Eye, must now always be taken into consideration in formulating and enforcing national policies, and will prove a great obstruction to Japan in China.

In this time of suspense and doubt the vernacular press of Japan is crying out for national leadership. The officials are blamed for not enlightening and directing public thought and doing something toward removing the political skepticism of the nation. One of the leading dailies, *The Yorodzu*, demands that the nation shall now decide whether it really believes in pacifism or militarism; whether Japan is prepared to declare to China that she has no territorial ambitions whatever in that country and whether Japan is prepared to reduce her armaments to a minimum consistent with safety? Japan, continues the paper, cannot rid herself of the old-time ambition after territorial aggrandizement in view of the ever-increasing population of the country; but it is a question whether Japan can ever command armaments sufficient to enforce this policy, and thus ignore the League of Nations, which has already placed Japan in a special category to limit her freedom. The League of Nations is a menace to Japan, concludes *The Yorodzu*. Thus the firm conviction in Japan is that the League of Nations must be modified to give Japan racial equality with all the members of the League or else Japan must play for its overthrow.

Meanwhile, the masses of the Japanese people, in ignorance of the real situation, are demanding information and direction, especially in regard to reform, not only in the bureaucratic methods of the national administration, but in regard to labor and industry generally. There are many among the middle classes of Japan who perceive the results of the war in Europe and America and are determined to make an effort to have Japan share in the new privileges and the new freedom. Social unrest, rendered more acute by the high cost of living and the extravagance of the profiteers and the *nouveaux riches*, without any corresponding increase of wages, is now loud in complaint against lack of official interest in the welfare of the people. Profiteers are still making fortunes in a night by cornering the staple food of the people, now selling at famine prices, and the authorities do nothing to control the situation. There is indeed every danger of a recurrence of the rice-riots that marked the course of events last summer. The Government has at last made some concession to labor by agreeing to permit the organization of trade unions, though the labor bureau created for the control of such societies will probably keep them in check and render them incapable of much independent action. To the demand for shorter hours of labor there has been little or no concession. Twelve to fourteen hours still represent a common day's work in factories. Consequently, between the social unrest at home and the new situation created internationally by the signing of the peace treaty, the Government and people of Japan are faced with unprecedented problems to solve; and how they can face this responsibility without welcoming the institutions of the nations that have defeated Germany it is not easy to see. Advocacy of western democracy is still regarded by officialdom in Japan as "dangerous thought." But to anyone familiar with the history of national evolution it will seem doubtful whether the more dangerous thought does not lie in refusing to abide by the demands of the age and to encourage adaptation to environment as the only hope of survival. Japan cannot place herself above the laws of human evolution. The people must come to their own. The sooner they are prepared for this, the safer for the nation. The vernacular press points to Russia as a warning.

J. INGRAM BRYAN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ghost of Beauty

By ROBERT P. UTTER

AT close of a November day—
A sullen sunset smouldering far away
Across the valley, over the dim hills—I found
On an upstanding mound
A feathered, fragile tuft of grass,
Fronting erect the sunset light,
Silvered with frost, and rosy bright.
Since then in years of pain
Nations have fallen, and armies passed like rain.
Still the frail ghost of beauty haunts the place,
With sweet remembered grace.
Winter or spring or summer I cannot
Pass by the spot
But to my eye there stands the little jet
Of rose-pink, jewelled light—and yet,
The fallen kings how quickly I forget.

In the Driftway

IN these days of university "drives" the Drifter almost wishes he were a professor. Professors are getting a good deal for their money, such as it is. Perhaps their salaries will be raised, and meanwhile there are the most agreeable by-products. Think of the multitude of hopes they can cherish, like the starving garrison of Lucknow, or like the desperate soul who watches the fascinating hand of the croupier. Think of the publicity that professors have come in for—especially all the shifts and contrivances to make a living which for centuries the ragged Muses have kept more or less below stairs. Now everybody knows where the professor belongs in the economic scale. Think of the pride he must feel in the compliments paid his wife by the earnest ladies who explain that she too must be thought of: she must be, of course, a person of refinement, as befits her station, and she must be kept softly—though not too softly—to sustain her station's dignity. Neither she nor her husband wants too much, the earnest ladies reassure the public, but there is their position! Now the professor had commonly thought his position merely that of an ordinary human being. The notion that he is something different, since his wife has to be, is another of the agreeable by-products of the drives. If this seems too vain a pride, there is humility to offset it—humility at being begged for in the street, even by millionaires, and even by millionaires who point out that the professor is at once necessity and asset and glory. But the really eminent by-product is that which, first indicated by President Lowell, has now, according to the newspapers, been elaborated by Mr. Hoover speaking in the West. This by-product is humiliation, and it comes from the doctrine of President Lowell and Mr. Hoover that the universities will be the breeding-grounds of a dangerous radicalism if we do not pay the professors better. When the professors were fat and comfortable, it seems, they upheld their patrons and the ancient order; but it was only fat that did it—in heart and head. Now they starve and rage. Ideas have nothing to do with the matter, or love for truth, or devotion to justice and honor and decency. Feed the professors lest they eat our young men and women.

HOW comes it, the Drifter asks himself, that in this day when autocracy lies wallowing in the dust somewhere in Germany, a monarch so absolute, so tyrannical, so imperious as the waste basket is still allowed to rule in our best steam-heated, vacuum-cleaned, electric-fanned, diffused-lighted offices—even in the editor's sanctum? The Drifter, you perceive, is about to start a drive for the dethronement of waste baskets, but he is not asking for any money, so you need not turn over the page yet. Consider for a moment that all the papers that pass through your hands in the course of the day—all the printed, typed, penned, or scribbled words—must find their way either into the desk drawers or into the waste basket. To pile anything on top of the desk is mere procrastination, and cannot be continued many days without the whole heap crashing on the floor when the telephone girl breezes by. The choice must be made all day between the sheep and the goats, the former winning safety in the desk, the latter going to destruction in the waste basket. If they were all sheep or goats it would be simple, but the dickens of it is that there are also musk oxen, antelopes, guinea pigs, and Shetland ponies. It is not easy to say offhand that some things should be saved and others sacrificed. And the waste basket gives no assistance. There it sits—or more correctly reigns—at your side, mocking, unsympathetic, inexorable. There is no appeal from the waste basket once a case is committed to its hands, no commutation of sentence or stay of execution. The executioner does not even wait until sunrise. In the form of a janitor's assistant he comes soon after sunset for his victims.

* * * * *

ALL this, the Drifter submits, is wrong. It is absolutism run riot. It is out-Kolchaking Kolchak (or even the Allies). The tyranny of the waste basket must be broken. Some system of referendum or recall should be devised. In his own home the Drifter has found a simple solution. There his waste basket is emptied only once a week, when he himself sets it out in the hall. Before doing so he eyes it thoughtfully for several seconds, stirs it as thoroughly as if he were mixing bread, and usually ends by upsetting the entire contents on the floor. Almost always he rescues some waif. Another scheme is that of the Drifter's brother. Whenever he is tormented with some article which he is not quite sure he wants to throw away, but does not want to be bothered with keeping himself, he tucks it away in some drawer or cubby-hole belonging to the Drifter, relying upon the latter not to cast out the cuckoo's egg, but to give the owner another chance of claiming and preserving it. It is some such system that the Drifter advocates for offices. He is not so bold that he would change the habits of janitors' assistants, but it occurs to him that one might have two waste baskets—one provisional and the other final. The provisional waste basket would be nearest the desk. It would be neutral ground protected by a white flag, and would never be emptied except by the owner, who from time to time would transfer portions of it to the permanent waste basket for destruction. Such a method would have all the advantages of two houses of Congress. It would embody the system of checks and balances so dear to the founders of the United States, plus the more recent political panaceas of the referendum and recall. The autocracy of the waste basket would thereby be constitutionalized, humanized, made safe for incompetency and——

THE DRIFTER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Liberals and the Peace

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your correspondent Mr. N. J. Ware (in *The Nation* of August 23) is right in his contention that the treaty is in accord with the wishes of the plain people of the victorious countries. While it is true, as you state, that the people mightily acclaimed Mr. Wilson and his peace policy when he first went to Europe, it is also true that the same people in Italy who were most emphatic in their welcome turned upon him fiercely when he proposed that they should yield some trifle of their "national aspirations" in the interest of world coöperation.

If he had openly trodden on the nationalistic toes of England and France; if he had insisted on real self-determination in India, Egypt, Ireland, or Alsace-Lorraine, would not the reaction in those countries have been much the same? The plain fact is that the war enhanced rather than weakened the super-nationalistic feeling among the peoples. The response to Mr. Wilson was largely emotional and by no means argues reasoned acceptance of his ideas, with the sacrifices and obligations incurred, as well as the benefit to accrue.

So far from condemning Mr. Wilson for not contriving to get his whole programme accepted, we should be thankful that we got as much (speaking from the liberal standpoint) as we did. The League covenant, while not a ninety-degree departure, means such a very respectable slant from the old system that, in the hands of liberally minded men, it is capable of leading to real world coöperation. The point that many liberal critics of the League covenant miss is that all indications cry out that political power is moving to the left instead of the right. Such critics are fond of drawing parallels between the post-Napoleonic settlement and this one. They ignore the existence of one pole-wide difference between conditions then and now. Then liberalism was drawn underground, not to emerge for thirty years. Liberalism, if we use the word in its broadest sense, comes out of this war enormously strengthened in spite of the present control (let it be granted) of reactionary parties. What, then, should be the attitude of liberals? Should we sulk and grouch because we did not get as much as we hoped for. Or should we say: "The future belongs to us! We can make the League of Nations a living, growing, thing."

Antrim, N. H., September 10 GEO. BURNHAM, JR.

No Newspapers for Debs

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In behalf of Eugene Debs, as well as for myself, I wish to thank you for having had *The Nation* sent to his prison cell. Ever since his removal to Atlanta all papers and periodicals, including *The Nation,* are denied him; and he is not allowed even newspaper clippings, enclosed in letters. The other day I enclosed in a letter to him a small newspaper cut of the proposed building to be erected at Indianapolis by the Comrades, which is to be known as the "House of Debs," but before the letter was delivered the little picture was removed therefrom.

It is quite evidently the purpose of the Administration to cut him off completely from the outside world in the ardent hope of breaking his spirit. Of course he is permitted to read light fiction furnished by the prison library, but in these days when history is being written as never before, this is as nourishing and satisfying to the mentality of a student of events as skimmed milk is to the body of a famished child.

Several years ago Gene planted a little peach tree in his yard. It struggled for existence, but with careful nursing it survived. This year for the first time it bore a few peaches. Knowing the care Gene had bestowed upon this little tree, Mrs. Debs packed half a dozen of the peaches and sent them to him in care of the Warden. They were not delivered, although at the very time he had just been removed from his cell to the hospital.

Terre Haute, Ind., September 15 THEODORE DEBS

A Parable in Chinese

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: This parable expresses in part my view of the Shantung outrage:

Once upon a time John Chu lost a good cow. It was not stolen by night, but was taken by force in broad day and he was compelled at the muzzle of a gun to agree to the separation. John knew that under existing conditions he could not recover his cow, but he never became reconciled to the loss; he bided his time.

By and by the thug who had taken the cow, together with a pal, became embroiled with three powerful neighbors. John thought this an opportune time to step in and recover his cow, but a near neighbor, Okinku Nippo, said "No, John, you stand back and I'll get it for you." John now claimed his cow, but Okinku said: "No, I must have the cow and one hundred dollars besides for salvage. But I'll give it back to you some day, John; trust my word." And the others said: "Let him have it, John. He won it; besides, he needs it."

Fayetteville, Ark., September 24 DAVID Y. THOMAS

To Oxonians in America

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: May I ask you to allow me to announce through your columns that a final and enlarged edition of the Roll of Service of the University of Oxford is now in preparation? Forms asking for information have been sent to all members of the University, past or present, who are known to have been on military or naval service, and whose addresses could be obtained.

The object of this letter is to request American Oxonians who have not received forms to send full information of their service either to the "Compiler of the Roll of Service" at their old college, or to me.

University Registry, Oxford, August 28 E. S. CRAIG

The World's Snarl

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Since the signing of the armistice, I have felt my understanding of world events greatly assisted by recalling from time to time what was to me the most significant feature of our instruction at the Camp Pike Officers' Training School, from which I was graduated. In that school, typical of its class, much more stress was laid upon learning to snarl, with bestial contortions of the face and appropriate ejaculations of the breath, than upon any other single military accomplishment. The psychological value of this daily training in inculcating men with the killing impulse is, of course, beyond cavil; it was insisted upon and supervised by military experts from overseas, and is doubtless a part of all latter-day military instruction.

That being the case, is it too far-fetched an imagining to conceive of all the war-worn nations with their faces still distorted by the expressions of rage and hatred which were thus imposed upon them by triumphant militarism? Does not that conception help explain many things, even the doings of the so-called Peace Conference? And is it not a hopeful thought that, after all, such training was needed, that men's faces do not now, as in past ages, naturally twist into the semblance of the ape's or the tiger's? Indeed, are there not many signs that that enforced world snarl, true product of militaristic teaching, is already slowly fading away from the face of mankind before the light of returning reason?

Palo Alto, Cal., September 6 ROBERT J. PEARSALL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

Dickens and His Friends

The Dickens Circle. A Narrative of the Novelist's Friendships. By J. W. T. Ley. E. P. Dutton and Company.

ANY point may be chosen as the centre of a circle, and, provided the radius be long enough, the circumference will include much; New York can be included within a circle whose centre is Boston; it does not follow that New York revolves around Boston. This is the difficulty with Mr. Ley's book. Though he distinguishes with some care between the different strata of the novelist's friendships and though he admits at times that Dickens belonged to some one or other great contemporary's "circle" rather than that the great contemporary belonged to Dickens's, nevertheless the general impression made is that Dickens (to use the threadbare figure of which Mr. Ley is fond) was the central sun around which the inferior, though often gigantic, planets moved. This is far from the facts of the matter. Landor, Carlyle, Leigh Hunt, Tennyson, Browning, Thackeray, and others were themselves suns with their own attendant trains. The perimeter of their systems overlapped that of Dickens's, but they were in no manner dependent upon him. A change of title and a slight shifting of emphasis would have obviated the false impression produced. The book tells of Dickens's friendships, not only with those lesser and in later years younger men who looked to Dickens as their leader, but with the great contemporaries among whom he moved as an equal. Mr. Ley, who was one of the founders of that cheerful little magazine "The Dickensian" and who is secretary of the Dickens Fellowship, is eminently qualified for his task. With patient enthusiasm he has amassed from numberless biographies and memoirs the facts of the novelist's relationship with friends among whom were many men as great as he and also many men and women whose only claim to remembrance is that they loved and were loved by Charles Dickens. The result, despite the large number of valueless trivialities recorded, is a supplement to Forster's "Life" (which is remarkably though perhaps unavoidably deficient in its treatment of Dickens's friendships) that cannot fail to charm the Dickens enthusiast (there are still very many such) and that is not uninstructive to the student of literature in general.

These friendships were remarkable not only for their number but also for their limitations. Dickens knew almost every great author of the Victorian era; with a host of them he was on terms of affectionate intimacy. Within the "literary set" there was but one remarkable lacuna: none of the Pre-Raphaelites seems to have come within the radius of his influence; Rossetti and Morris are never mentioned, nor is George Meredith (in early days much in Rossetti's company), though the influence of Dickens is easily perceptible in Meredith's first great novel. Swinburne, in later life an ardent Dickensian, played as a boy on one occasion with Dickens's children. The novelist knew also, and often knew intimately, many journalists, many actors, and many artists. But statesmen and politicians, unless like Lytton they were primarily writers, found no place in his circle. Mr. Ley notes how frequently contemptuous references to them occur in his books. By implication Mr. Ley excludes such public men only from the "circle." Yet there were other wide gaps that are even more instructive because they help to reveal clearly Dickens's intellectual limitations. No illustrious scientist seems to have crossed his path with sufficient proximity to be drawn into an orbit around him; Darwin, Lyell, Tyndall, Huxley—none of these is ever mentioned. This is the case with philosophers like Mill and Spencer, with theologians like Newman and Pusey. With such men Dickens had nothing in common. He lived in a world of emotion rather than of thought. He was an Aprile, not a Paracelsus. To know him was to love him and generally to be loved in turn. A lessening of intimacy was in some cases inevitable, but positive alienations were rare, and it seems that not one of these but was bridged again before death. Of the most famous of these rare severances, the quarrel with Thackeray, in which Dickens was certainly in the wrong, Mr. Ley gives an accurate and impartial account. In fact, in all cases in which the conduct of his hero is open to criticism Mr. Ley has chosen wisely neither to suppress nor distort. Few reputations suffer less by absolute truthfulness than does that of Charles Dickens. And even a fame so great as his may be added to by this book, into the making of which so much friendliness has gone.

Land for Soldiers

The Land and the Soldier. By Frederic C. Howe. Charles Scribner's Sons.

MR. HOWE'S book has great value as an outline of what a conscientious people might do through its government towards the opening up of opportunities for its fighters in the recent war. Naturally, the author's thoughts turn to that original workshop, the land. There are reasons enough why the returned soldiers should be encouraged to adopt farming. Many of them require healthful employment in the open air. Others have grown discontented with sedentary life. And finally, the world needs, not only that more farm produce should be available for the cities, but that agriculture should be rescued from the comparative disrespect into which it has fallen and be given its due place among the professions. Psychological considerations cannot, however, be disregarded, as Mr. Howe wisely recognizes. The returned soldier "is accustomed to group action. He has been speeded up to a high state of nervous tension. There is no lure to him in the gift of 160 acres of land, unimproved and requiring years to bring it into cultivation. Rather than accept such payment from the State he will drift to the city." Mr. Howe concludes that a new type of coöperative farming must be evolved, with all the resources which applied science has already conferred upon city life in telephones, electric light, amusements, good roads, and automobiles.

By way of stimulating the American imagination as to the immense agricultural possibilities that lie in our huge, sparsely populated territories, Mr. Howe compares the experiments in farm-colonizing that invite attention in Denmark, England, Australia, New Zealand, and elsewhere. Denmark is, of course, the most signal instance of what may be accomplished, even with severely limited resources, through coöperative effort. What that little country has done towards feeding its neighbor nations with dairy produce is already known, but Mr. Howe provides further statistics. The coöperative or labor-saving principle has, we are informed, been adopted in the farm colonies of Australia, with substantial benefit, and also in some of those garden-cities of England which own a surrounding belt of agricultural land. In the chapter "America's First Colony" an account is given of the recent California land settlement act under which 10,000 acres have been purchased, to be controlled by a commission of which Professor Elwood Mead is chairman. Here again, coöperation and mutual aid are to be the chief features, supplemented by loans of money from the government for purchasing equipment and defraying the cost of the initial labor, The applicants for farms under this scheme up to June, 1918, had been more than double the available allotments. It is not made clear whether the land bought by the commission conforms to the conditions laid down in the chapter entitled "Sites," in which Mr. Howe emphasizes the importance of location as affecting the success of whatever attempts America may make towards the problem of farm colonies. "They should be near city markets. There should be colonies in the neighborhood of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Cleveland, and Chicago." "For why," he asks, "should America waste the labor and lives of her men in reclaiming miasmatic swamps and in stumping forests, when there is unused land in abundance in the settled and fertile parts of the country?"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But fascinating as are these tales of garden cities, farm colonies, and coöperative industries, the reader of critical habits will always want to know something more than he is here told, especially if he be asked to commit himself to approval of a still larger extension of governmental activity along the same lines. For example, does the individual ownership of farms on which the success of colonization schemes is assumed to turn, encourage mortgages and the dominance of the money-lender? What has been the actual experience of Denmark in this respect? Is there truth in the rumor that the English act of 1907 and the Scottish of 1911 for small holdings have both been "ghastly failures"? Have the garden-city projects of Germany and England solved any real problem or altered the direction of economic forces by a hair's-breath? Have any such schemes or all of them taken together tended towards the raising of wages? Is it even possible that the privilege of living in a low-rented cottage at Letchworth (the first of the English garden-cities), where numerous factories are established, may have tempted London workers to offer themselves there for lower wages than those prevailing in the metropolis? What has been the effect upon the general level of ground rents in the immediate vicinity of these garden-cities and villages? To what extent have they benefited the rent-takers at the expense of the rent-payers?

On reaching the last chapter, "The Redemption of Farming," and particularly Section 8, "The Basic Reform of Democracy," we find that Mr. Howe is alive to the doubts and perplexities that may vex the souls of thoughtful liberals in regard to the ownership and control and taxation of land. His "basic reform" would be to place the burden of taxation upon the socially created values of land and natural opportunities; to tax the farmer, that is, for what society does for him—reflected, according to Mr. Howe's reasoning, in the site value of his farm. This final chapter provides the keynote to this admirable book.

Currents of Spanish Literature

Main Currents of Spanish Literature. By J. D. M. Ford. Henry Holt and Company.

LAST year Professor Ford delivered eight lectures on Spanish literature before the Lowell Institute of Boston. Of these he has made a book singularly readable and valuable. No complete survey of the field is attempted. A fuller and more scientific treatment of the subject will be given by the same author in his "Brief History of Spanish Literature," announced for early publication. In plan the present book is much the same as Fitzmaurice-Kelly's "Chapters on Spanish Literature." If many of the greatest names in Spanish literature are passed over without mention, if whole epochs and movements are untouched, the loss in completeness is amply compensated for by the gain in perspective and clarity. The development of important genres is traced from the origins to a period just short of the present. Two chapters are devoted to the epic and the ballad, another to Cervantes, two more to the drama of the Golden Age, one to lyric poetry, one to the novel, and the last lecture is devoted to a summary treatment of the "High Points of Spanish-American Literature." On the other hand there is no account of the mystics, the historians, the critics and philosophers, the Romantic drama, and the contemporary "renaissance" inaugurated by "the generation of 1898." If Mr. Ford reacts wholesomely against the exaggerated appreciation now being accorded to Blasco Ibáñez, he neglects to treat those great contemporary figures in Spanish literature equally or better worthy of our attention: Benavente, the Alvarez Quintero brothers, the Machados, Juan Ramón Jiménez, Villaespesa, Azorín, Pérez de Ayala, Pío Baroja, Valle-Iclán, Unamuno, and others.

A careful workman like Mr. Ford is guilty of few errors. Some, however, should be indicated. Few scholars will now agree with him that the "Poem of the Cid" and other early Castilian epics were written in a regular meter. Evidence accumulates rapidly that numerous Spanish poets of the middle ages did not count their syllables. In this connection one is surprised to find in so recent a work no mention of the newly discovered epic fragment "Roncesvalles," so damaging, in the evidence it affords, to the old theory of metrical regularity. The forthcoming publication of Señor P. Henríquez Ureña's extensive researches on early Spanish prosody will doubtless clarify this still debatable question. The statement (p. 50) that the ballad knows nothing of the elves and fairies is too sweeping to be true. Cervantes did not enter the service of Cardinal Acquaviva while the latter was in Madrid (p. 72). The date of the battle of Lepanto is 1571, not 1570 as given (p. 72). Mr. Ford was probably misled by Fitzmaurice-Kelly who makes the same error. So much reckless conjecture has been indulged in by Cervantes's biographers that one could well dispense with the bold suggestion (p. 74) that the great novelist gained immunity, when in the hands of the Moors, by feigning insanity. As Mr. Ford admits, this is speculation unsupported by evidence. Don John of Austria is spoken of as still living when Cervantes returned to Madrid in 1580 (p. 75). He had died two years previously. In declaring Cervantes's plays to have little merit, exception should have been made of the Interludes (p. 88). These rank among Cervantes's best works. "Ill-Advised Curiosity" is a poor translation of *El Curioso Impertinente.* The "Exemplary Tales" may give offence to the prudish, but it is going too far to compare them to the pornography of Zola, de Maupassant, and D'Annunzio (p. 91). To say that the romances of chivalry acquired prominence "at least as early as 1508" (p. 96) is a serious error. The "Amadis of Gaul," "El Caballero Cifar," and others date from the middle of the fourteenth century; and if one has in mind only printed versions, "Tirant lo Blanch" was printed in 1490. When Espronceda arrived in London, Theresa was not a married woman, nor did his elopement with her take place in England (p. 198). To call the Espronceda of 1840 "a leading socialist" (p. 199) is inaccurate. He was always an individualist, and in the year mentioned was becoming a very conservative person. Juan Manuel was not a predecessor of Cervantes in the writing of *novelas* (p. 212). He wrote *exempla,* a wholly different form of prose narration. Cervantes did not use the word *novela* in the modern sense of the word, but in the Italian acceptation of a short story treated artistically. He cannot have been ignorant of the existence of the crude *exempla.* It was precisely to introduce into Spain a more artistic form that he wrote *novelas* to replace the *exempla* and *patrañas,* the forms of the short story then current. One may well doubt that Fernán Caballero wrote French and German with the same facility as Spanish (p. 218). We have only to read her preserved French and German fragments to see that she was almost illiterate in those languages.

As a critic of literature Mr. Ford occasionally betrays religious bias. His book is written from a Roman Catholic point of view, and this is well, not merely because he often provides a corrective to Ticknor's Protestant prejudices, but because certain writers of Spain can only be appreciated to the full by their co-religionaries. Nevertheless this attitude renders him unsympathetic toward many who have attacked abuses in church and state. He is unduly harsh in his estimate of writers like Juan Valera, Pardo Bazán, Palacio Valdés, Pérez Galdós, and Espronceda. He is more attracted by conservatives like Fernán Caballero and Pereda. Blanco White, who abandoned Catholicism to enter the Unitarian fold, is branded "a religious maniac." Cardinal Newman, White's friend, understood White better.

Throughout the book Mr. Ford quotes copiously from English and American translators of Spanish poets. To these he adds a few excellent renderings of his own. The most noteworthy are his metrical translations of Campoamor and a few passages of the "Poem of the Cid." In the latter case he employs the 8+8 syllable verse, which he conceives to be the meter of the original, without trying to make the lines assonate. The effect is pleasing, if more regular than the original probably was.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sense and Sentiments

The Querrils. By Stacy Aumonier. The Century Company.
Yellow Leaf. By Sacha Gregory. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.
Our Casualty. By G. A. Birmingham. George H. Doran Company.

THE short stories with which Mr. Stacy Aumonier made his appearance in literature some years ago had a sharp and virile tang. They had an amazing way of showing the density of life; they were as concrete as actual things, wood or cheese or leather. They were so good of their kind that no improvement could be expected. What one waited for was merely more of them. That expectation has not been wholly fulfilled. Mr. Aumonier's novels are milder, less racy, less redolent of the savors of life. They are more intellectual and he thinks far less well than he perceives. The short story and the novelette seem, furthermore, to be his natural medium. In the novel his best qualities are diluted, and since their concentration was their chief virtue, the result is disappointing. Even in their diluted state, however, they threaten to eke out but a short novel, and so Mr. Aumonier helps himself out by inventing plots which, though both clever and credible, are on another and a lower plane than the excellence which seemed peculiarly his own. He is probably a victim, in part at least, of the very harmful notion entertained by publishers that novels, like tins of beef, must be uniform in price and therefore so in size.

This does not mean that "The Querrils" is an undistinguished piece of work. Mr. Aumonier presents to us a very typical and yet highly individualized British family. They are gentle, humane, lovable, well-bred. Their chief effort in life is to keep its surface fine; their chief convention, that the strong and ugly and stirring things do not exist. "It was a tradition of the family to discuss flippantly the things that mattered, and seriously the things that didn't matter." Thus, despite an overflowing affectionateness among its members, each member of the family was in the deepest sense alone, even as the group itself was consciously isolated from all the turbulence of life. Now Mr. Aumonier's theme was, originally at least, to show the world of reality taking its revenge upon this delicate and artificial bit of civilization. Bitter and brutal things crash into the calm of the Querril set. The younger son is accused and convicted of a disgraceful crime; the older marries a scientifically minded and, from the Querril point of view, crudely outspoken Swedish girl. Then the war shakes the very earth under their feet and scatters them. The older son is killed. Throughout, Querril Sr. maintains with a fine though futile heroism the conventions of his class and family. But so, and this is the surprising thing, do they all. The intention of the novel, which seemed to be, so clearly, to show the essential weakness of the Querrils' method of life, is lost and that method is exhibited finally as emerging triumphantly from all the shocks of circumstance and as, indeed, a kind of romantic glorification of the spirit of the British Empire. Mr. Aumonier actually ends with a lengthy paraphrase of "The White Man's Burden" and the unmistakable implication that the Querrils are the only "white men" in the world. Mr. Querril or the Englishman "with all his vanities and inanities, repressions, limitations, and hypocricies, is quite the best of the lot." It may be so. But art needs a mellower and broader humanity and a more embracing thought. Upon this road of romantic nationalism Mr. Aumonier is not likely to regain his old solidity and soundness.

"Yellow Leaf" is a rather remarkable example of a quite different and now uncommon type of novel. It is not and it is not meant to be a representation of life. It is highly "composed" in the pictorial sense, and the objects and values in the composition are selected not for their verisimilitude but for their wealth and glow and harmony of emotional effect. The book is full of beautiful and distinguished faces, of grandiose though measured gestures, of rich and self-sufficing passions. Its total effect is like the sombre gloss of dark velvet or like a deep red wine in a beaker of dull bronze. At its best it recalls the work of the Brontës, at its worst one's faint memories of "St. Elmo." The tradition is, of course, the same. The people of the story, with one exception, neither toil nor spin. They are aristocrats and fabulously wealthy and live in houses and gardens that are like retreats and sanctuaries. The exception is, of course, the villain—a musician and a foreigner, a portentous Persian who marries into the noble house of Dampierre and nearly destroys it, but is himself destroyed by the indomitable Lady Mary. If that sounds melodramatic in the ordinary and crass sense it does the book wrong. There is no falseness here because there is no effort after truth. The book is a belated example of the romantic novel. It is a gorgeous dream about life. It is raised above the level of the stories in Keepsakes that Emma Bovary used to read by the dominance of sixty years of naturalism in the novel, which always keeps Mr. Gregory's imagination within reasonable limits. It is also raised above that level by his literary skill and by his power of definite and not, as was so often the case with the romantics, of diffused visualization. The aged Lady Mary Dampierre at her embroidery frame, the Italian butler Bruno before his glimmering altar, the melting back of Jimmy Dampierre into the child he really was—these are pictures that cling to the mind. In view of the book's obvious character and unusual merits in its kind, it is amusing to note that it is advertised as "worthy of the best traditions of our great modern English writers—Galsworthy, Bennett, and others of the same school." That is exactly what it is not. Galsworthy and Bennett strip reality; Mr. Gregory swathes it. He swathes it in purple and fine linen, in strange sorrows and unheard-of nobilities and exotic terrors. "Yellow Leaf" is not at all like "Clayhanger"; it is like "The Picture of Dorian Grey." It is not like a ploughed field; it is like a group of hothouse flowers. The flowers will be withered tomorrow, but for a day their fragrance is enchanting enough.

The common contrast in our literature to that new realism which Mr. Aumonier attempts and which Galsworthy and Bennett and Maugham achieve is not exemplified by an isolated piece of purely romantic fiction such as "Yellow Leaf," but by the cheery sentimentalism of Mr. G. A. Birmingham. In his war stories the French fields and trenches are represented as the scene of an awfully jolly though slightly dirty picnic, quite as they are in "The Better 'Ole." In his Irish stories the difficult conflict of a people is pictured as a sort of musical comedy affair—half cheap romance and farce, half beaming toasts to the Empire! Mr. Birmingham is an outspoken exponent of the theory of life and art according to which "problems" are uninteresting to the healthy-minded and the vital things are to be left in "decent obscurity." Now perhaps the central motive of all our better modern literature is derived from the fact that obscurity is generally dangerous and rarely decent. Mr. Birmingham himself furnishes us with an excellent little fable on the subject. A young man drives a Daimler motor down Grafton street in Dublin at the rate of thirty miles an hour. "I had the street to myself. It was rather fun seeing all the other cars and carts and things piled up on the footpaths and the people bolting into the shops like rabbits." It seems "rather fun" to Mr. Birmingham too. He leaves the trouble and indignity and injury of the owners of the cars and of the people who bolted like rabbits in "decent obscurity." These victorious optimists always do. That is why they can be so optimistic. This is the sort of story, however, which, as Shaw so admirably points out in "The Quintessence of Ibsenism," no longer amuses us. Nobody plays practical jokes any longer and hazing is forbidden. But that sort of insensitiveness in humor is usually the obverse of the sentimental view of life, according to which war is a gentleman's outing and all journeys end in lovers' meeting.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drama

Mr. Belasco Explains

FOR thirty-seven years Mr. David Belasco has devoted himself to the art of the theatre. In remote cities where no other American manager's name would be recognized, his is known. If a girl is applauded in amateur theatricals in Peoria or Denver she writes for counsel and help to David Belasco. There is a Belasco legend composed of anecdotes that commercial travellers swap in smoking-cars; there is a Belasco biography in two stout volumes by the late William Winter; there is, finally, issued but the other day, the word of Mr. Belasco himself.[1] The critics may jeer mildly; the knowing ones among the public may show a correct disdain. They are all impressed. A Belasco opening—the first of any given season above all—still commands its very special little alertness and thrill.

And why should not these people be impressed? Mr. Belasco's dedication to his chosen art is as tireless as it is complete. He has spared no toil and no expense to produce what he considers beautiful things. He has never been cynical about his success, but has taken it to be the reward of his hard gained merits. He is satisfied with himself and with his public. He has made art pay. He still makes it pay. And who has the right to deny the unfailing qualities of every Belasco production—the silken delicacy of its surface, the unobtrusive perfection of its visible details, the gentle glow and harmony of its color schemes? Not those, assuredly, who daily applaud the less perfect productions of quite similar plays on another street. Nor those others who, in high places and humble ones, proclaim the theatrical theory of the drama—the theory, namely, that plays are "built" in the theatre, not written in solitude; that they are constructed to be gladly heard by any audience of the moment, not created to be overheard by the finer spirits of the age.

Of that theory Mr. Belasco's practice is the best of all possible illustrations. A manuscript to him is not something to be interpretatively bodied forth. It is a little raw material and a convenient starting-point. "Almost invariably," he tells us, "the exceptionally successful play is not written but re-written." During the crucial week of preliminary rehearsals, he continues, "I rewrite, transpose, change, and cut until the manuscript is so interlined that it is almost impossible to read it. . . . If it seems too heavy at a certain point, it must be lightened; if too tearful, laughter must be brought into it." It is no wonder that Mr. Belasco is the author or co-author of many of the plays he has produced, and that he has sedulously avoided the work of any master. What could he do with the method of production so truly attributed to another manager in another land, the method that strives to give to each play "its individual style, its special atmosphere, its peculiar inner music."[2] "Who am I?" asked Oscar Wilde, only half in jest, when he was urged to make changes in "An Ideal Husband" for the production of the play, "Who am I to tamper with a masterpiece?" Mr. Belasco has not tampered with masterpieces. He has left them alone. And that is what every producing manager must do who desires—as our professors counsel and indeed command—to build successful plays in the theatre.

To Mr. Belasco, at all events, the play has been but one of many things. "The all-important factor in a dramatic production," he tells us, "is the lighting of the scenes." And again: "The greatest part of my success in the theatre I attribute to my feeling for colors translated into effects of light." He has ransacked the curio shops of ancient cities for furniture and the fabled East for silken draperies and has found in these "explorations in search of stage equipment really the most interesting part" of his work. And he has sought out charming and promising young persons and chosen and adjusted them as he would select and adjust folds of rich velvet or the glow of a new tint of light into the harmony of a production. He has "made" Frances Starr and Jeanne Eagels and Leonora Ulric and Ina Claire. He has fitted them like brilliant bits of glass into the shifting colors of his successive scenes. And yet this prestidigitator of light and shadows, this clever artificer, this glorified interior decorator, whose consciousness has never been touched by either life or art, holds himself to be a realist. "I am a realist," he proclaims proudly and sincerely. And he is a realist because on his stage he "will allow nothing to be built of canvas stretched on frames. Everything must be real." He is a realist because when he produced "The Music Master" he "searched for people in the theatres of the lower East side"; because he employed real Japanese in "The Darling of the Gods" and caused the Uhlans in "Marie-Odile" to be represented by real Germans! In such preoccupations he has spent a lifetime of labor and has ended by impressing a nation. He has touched nothing that he has not, in his own inimitable sense, adorned.

What has he touched? He could never, as we have seen, produce the work of a great dramatist. No great dramatist would have endured the process. He has given us one play by Pierre Wolff and one by Hermann Bahr. He saw the unfulfilled promise of Eugene Walter and staged "The Easiest Way." The rest is sentiment and drapery—"The Music Master" and "Du Barry," "The Auctioneer" and "The Darling of the Gods." He ventured on "Tiger, Tiger," but accompanied it by the ultra-saccharine "Daddies"; he re-wrote and re-built "Dark Rosaleen" until it was pretty and trivial enough; he has just engaged Mr. Albert Bruning only to load him with Chinese robes in a spectacle play by George Scarborough. He likes to have children on the stage as often as possible and hence avoids plays in which there are none. For such plays, in his opinion, "view life flippantly and cynically, like the comedies of Bernard Shaw"; he is blandly unconscious of the contemporary practice of his profession elsewhere, except to fling a querulous word at Max Reinhardt, a producing manager who, during the first eight years of his career, presented one play each by Aristophanes, Euripides, Calderon, Molière, Goldoni, Lessing, Henri Becque, Tolstoi, Hauptmann, Donnay, Chekhov, Gorgi, and J. M. Synge, two by Hebbel, Kleist, Gogol, Strindberg and Schnitzler, three by Grillparzer, Wilde, and Maeterlinck; four by Schiller, Goethe, Wedekind, and Hofmannsthal; five by Ibsen; six by Shaw; and nine by Shakespeare!

"The Gold Diggers" by Avery Hopwood (Lyceum Theatre) is Mr. Belasco's first production of the present season. It is also a perfect example of his art. There is a foolish little story about a savage uncle who wishes to rescue his nephew from a chorus girl and himself falls a prey to the charms of another. There is a sunny little moral about chorus girls duly emphasized by a gray-haired mother. But neither the story nor the moral is very obtrusive. These, as well as Mr. Hopwood's little local jests, serve, after all, only to call attention to a burst of morning sunlight which Nature would do well to emulate more often, to Mr. Belasco's exquisite bits of color, to the influence of his training upon the talent and personality of his latest creation, Miss Ina Claire. The latter illustrates his most solid gift. He can train actresses. Miss Claire's rendering of her lines in the first act has the daintiest verisimilitude and the nicest precision in its miniature way; her crucial scene in the second act, in which she feigns intoxication so well and yet never lets us lose a sense of spiritual delicacy, is a little marvel of its kind. But the almost total waste of talent and hard work exemplified in these bits symbolizes once more and depressingly enough the character of Mr. Belasco's whole career. Miss Claire has intelligence and flexibility; Miss Jobyna Howland has her unfailing vein of natural and robust humor; Mr. Bruce McRae is a careful artist; quite minor members of the cast do credit to Mr. Belasco's persuasive methods. Thus a highly agreeable entertainment is offered, an entertainment that eludes criticism by never coming within its proper range. But we dare neglect

[1] *The Theatre through its Stage Door.* By David Belasco. Harper and Brothers.
[2] *Max Reinhardt.* By Siegfried Jacobsohn. Berlin. 1910.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neither the show nor the master of the show so long as any are left among us who believe that either one sustains the slightest relation to the drama or the drama's interpretation on the stage of our time. L. L.

Art

The National Treatment of a National Asset

SCHOOLS are reopening, masters are in harness again, students are settling down to the year's work, and the possibility of a training in the industrial arts is as remote as ever. The need for the training has not lost its urgency, nor the realization of the need its acuteness. The industrial war, which the American was warned would follow the war of arms, has begun. Germany has unloaded her first shipload of German goods at an American port. Other countries, always allied or once alien, are hurrying into the commercial competition as fast as strikes and unrest will allow. America, the President says, has the world's leadership in her grasp—if the Senate will but behave. And, all the while, those who understand the situation know that industry in America cannot lead, cannot compete, cannot prevent an ever-increasing dumping of German or any other goods on American shores until artists and artisans are trained for the contest, and that they cannot be trained until there are properly equipped schools for the purpose.

The few wise voices crying in the industrial wilderness have had their influence and led to an occasional movement in the right direction. Many industrial art exhibitions have been organized: the French Industrial Arts at the Pennsylvania Hotel, and now on tour; the Arts and Crafts at Buffalo, to be followed by a second; another Arts and Crafts to open at St. Louis on the 15th of October and, if it succeeds, to become a national, perhaps an international event; the Industrial Arts in the American Museum of Natural History arranged for November. But industrial art exhibitions, admirable as practical arguments and object lessons, are not practical training grounds. They alone cannot meet the nation's great need. How pressing this need is would be proved by the fact that even Washington has been roused, not to the extent of establishing a Ministry of the Fine Arts or founding a National Industrial Art School, in which many see the one solution to the problem—though *The Nation* does not—but at least to publishing official documents on the subject and to officially recognizing its importance. "Industrial Art. A National Asset" is the title of a recent pamphlet issued by the Bureau of Education.

The title is promising. Progress has been made when the Government begins to see in art the asset it really is. The disappointment is to learn how little original thought or attention the Government has given to the matter once it has admitted a national responsibility. The pamphlet consists of the "Series of Graphic Charts" prepared by Mr. H. M. Kutzworth of the Grand Rapids School of Art and Industry, and submitted by him to the Federation of Arts at its Convention in May, 1918—so slowly do conventions and governments move. The Convention, impressed with the Charts and also with the sad state of industrial art in the country, urged "the Bureau of Education to issue more publications on industrial art topics," and the Bureau, finding the Charts made to its hand, issued them as its second "Industrial Education Circular." Whether it is a mistake to publish material already used depends altogether upon the nature of the material. The charts, eleven in number, have for object to demonstrate the value of art to industry. They are ingenious, careful, full of facts and figures; they run to national statistics; they even produce a diagram or two. Each, moreover, is elaborately analyzed, charts being puzzles to which the average mind is without a clue, and the analysis abounds in familiar platitudes appropriate to the theme. But the trouble is that, at this late stage, nobody concerned doubts the value of art to industry. The truth has been shouted too eloquently from the housetops. The nation wants not charts to prove what is known already, but the facilities for putting the knowledge into practice. Facts and figures, statistics and diagrams, though ably supported by platitudes, bring the nation not one step nearer the solution of its problem.

There has been so much of this sort of talk that its repetition by the Bureau of Education seems worse than superfluous. When people are staggering under their burden, no good is done by continuing to remind them of its existence; when they are conscious that their situation is serious, they get no relief from a chart or an essay on psychology, morality, æsthetics. But men and authorities otherwise intelligent and matter-of-fact, once they are confronted with art, seem to lose themselves in a maze of sentiment and bathos. It is characteristic of the prevailing attitude that the director of the St. Louis Exposition, which surely justifies itself, must further recommend it as an ally to prohibition. "Take away the saloon," he cries, "and the substitution of beauty is imperative," though, the saloon gone, beauty might still be thought to have formidable rivals in the movies, the comics, the poster by the wayside. This irrelevant talk would be useless even if the public for whom it is meant had remained blind to the fact that industry without art is not strong enough to hold its own in the world competition for trade. But the special public appealed to has had its eyes opened. It asks, not for light, but for the means to obtain this strength. It begs for practical methods, and, with rare exceptions, the schools of industrial art throughout the country supply it with nothing more substantial than theories, sentiment, spiritual "uplift." The German, the Frenchman, even the Briton, can get a sound technical training and his Government sees to it that he does. But not the American who aspires to leadership. The Government, since it realizes that industrial art is a national asset and has decided to contribute to the literature on the subject, might better publish good straight talks by technical authorities on the technical equipment and conduct of technical art schools than charts that prove nothing except a truth the nation has discovered by hard experience, and therefore could not forget if it would. N. N.

All Students of Current History

should have the following authoritative documents:

The League of Nations ..... 15c.
A Practical Suggestion by Lieut.-Gen. Rt. Hon. J. C. Smuts, P. C.
Decrees and Constitution of Soviet Russia .... 25c.
Majority and Minority Reports of Coal Industry Commission of Great Britain ..... 25c.

Get these at your bookshop, or direct from

The Nation Press, Inc.

20 Vesey Street New York

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Nation
International Relations Section

Contents

THE DISPOSITION OF THE GERMAN COLONIES
By Alpheus Henry Snow 527

BRITISH IMPERIALISTS AND GERMAN COLONIAL POLICY 530

The Disposition of the German Colonies

By ALPHEUS HENRY SNOW

I

IN considering the disposition to be made of Germany's interests in territory and sovereignty outside its domestic frontiers, it is necessary to distinguish its colonies—that is, those regions of whose territory it had full title and over whose people it had full sovereignty—from its concessions—that is, the easements in land and personal privileges which had been granted to it by a state, to be exercised by it upon the territory and under the sovereignty of that state.

The German colonies were Togoland, Cameroon, German East Africa, German Southwest Africa, German New Guinea, and certain islands in the Pacific Ocean; the interests which it had in China (including those under the Shantung treaty), Siam, and other states being concessions.

For purposes of disposition, the colonies were grouped and divided thus:

Togoland, Cameroon, and German East Africa formed a group. All these colonies were tropical and were densely inhabited by blacks, with a few white settlers. They were all within the Conventional Basin of the Congo as fixed by the Berlin African Act of 1885, and also within the much larger Middle African Zone of International Influence established by the Brussels African Act of 1890, and were subject to the provisions of these international acts. This group was divided into two parts, one consisting of Togoland and Cameroon, and the other of German East Africa. France and Great Britain owned colonies adjoining Togoland and Cameroon; British and Portuguese colonies adjoined German East Africa; and the Belgian Congo lay between Cameroon and German East Africa.

German Southwest Africa required to be considered separately. It was outside the Congo Basin and the International Zone. Its climate was healthful. Its population included a considerable settlement of whites, and a large number of partly civilized blacks. The adjoining regions were British and Portuguese. The Union of South Africa had long desired to annex it; but according to international law such annexation could be effected only by Great Britain first annexing German Southwest Africa as a colony and then placing it by executive order or Act of Parliament under the jurisdiction of South Africa.

German New Guinea also required to be considered separately. It formed a part of the large island of New Guinea lying off the north coast of Australia, the rest of the island being divided into two parts, one of which was a colony of Great Britain and the other a colony of Holland. Within the German Colony of New Guinea was located the headquarters of the government of Germany's Pacific Island possessions. The Commonwealth of Australia had long desired to annex the whole island of New Guinea as a colony, but could acquire territory only through Great Britain.

Of the other German islands south of the equator, the Bismarck and the Solomon Islands might be regarded either separately or as grouped with German New Guinea. German Samoa is a part of a group, the remainder of which is owned by the United States. The German Samoan Islands were desired by New Zealand. Here, as in the case of South Africa and Australia, the acquisition could be effected only through Great Britain.

North of the equator lie the Ladrone, Caroline, Pelew, and Marshall Islands. These might be regarded either separately or as part of a group; but the group, in order to be complete, would have to include the Philippines and Guam, which they surround. The Marshall Islands lie between the Philippines and Hawaii—that is, between the United States and China. The manner of disposition of all these islands was especially important to the United States.

By commitments of Great Britain to Australia, South Africa and New Zealand, it was arranged that they should conquer the German colonies desired by them, and that Great Britain would do all in its power to secure their conquests to them at the peace. By unpublished understanding between Great Britain and France, they were to conquer Togoland and Cameroon, and to support each other at the peace in obtaining a disposition to them jointly, subject to partition by their agreement, France agreeing to support the British claim to German East Africa, subject to arrangement with Belgium.

In February and March, 1917, Japan, in the same secret agreement with Great Britain and France by which they acquiesced in its claim to have Germany's Shantung concessions, secured their consent to conquer the German Islands north of the equator and their agreement to support its claim to those islands. Great Britain's acquiescence was on the understanding, which was accepted by Japan, that Japan would "in the eventual peace settlement treat in the same spirit Great Britain's claims to the German Islands south of the Equator." France agreed to Japan's demand in consideration that Japan would agree—as it did—to "give its support to obtain from China the breaking of its diplomatic relations with Germany," Japan also agreeing to use its efforts so that China, upon the breach of diplomatic relations, would proceed to confiscate all German in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terests within its territory and eject or eliminate Germans and German influence.

Against the military operations of the Allies, resistance was made by Germans to the utmost extent possible. In German New Guinea and the Pacific Islands other than German Samoa, resistance by the few resident Germans was out of the question, and the conquest consisted merely in taking possession. In the African colonies, Allies and Germans were assisted by forces of blacks trained and led by them. Togoland and Cameroon were captured by a British and French force; German Southwest Africa by forces of the Union of South Africa; German East Africa by a British and East Indian force with forces from the Belgian Congo; German New Guinea and the islands in the Pacific south of the equator (not including German Samoa) by an Australian naval expedition; German Samoa by a New Zealand naval expedition; and the German Pacific Islands north of the equator by a Japanese naval expedition.

Conquests of colonies inhabited by aboriginal tribes, it has long been realized, involve the setting of these tribes against each other and tend to demoralize them and make them dangerous to civilization. The two parties of civilized men who are fighting each other, few in number on account of climatic conditions, and surrounded by the natives, from the necessity of the case use threats, persuasion, bribery, and flattery, and play upon the emotions of these ignorant and childlike peoples, in order to obtain their military assistance in the struggle. With a view to prevent the injury to the natives and the devastation of settlements and missions caused by arousing their fighting spirit, a determined effort was made by the United States, at the time when the question of Middle Africa first arose, to place it in a situation where it could not be used as a theatre of war by civilized states. At the Berlin African Conference of 1885, the United States, supported by Germany and Great Britain, nearly succeeded in obtaining the insertion in the final act of a provision whereby the whole Conventional Basin of the Congo would have been permanently neutralized under international guaranty. The sentiment of the Conference was strongly in favor of this action. France tenaciously opposed it, the French chief delegate, Baron de Courcel, asserting that neutralization of the region was impracticable because "when a state is at war, it wages war by all the means in its power." The Conference did, however, adopt a provision requiring the signatories of the final act to use their good offices to induce the belligerents in European wars to neutralize the Middle African colonies of either or both of them during the war by mutual agreement. The United States, as Secretary of State Root held in 1907, though not a party to the Berlin African Act as a whole, since the Senate did not ratify it, is, by reason of being a party to the Brussels African Act, a party by adoption to all that part of the Berlin Act which has for its object the protection of the native inhabitants. But neither the United States, when it was neutral, nor any of the parties to the Berlin Act, tendered its good offices to the belligerents in the late war for the purpose of having its Middle African colonies neutralized during the war's continuance.

It has been maintained that the capture of the German colonies by the Allies did not have the character of a conquest, because Germany acquired its title to them illegally. An examination of the facts, however, shows that its titles were acquired according to methods recognized by international law and practiced by other states, and that they had many times been confirmed by treaties and international arrangements.

It has also been stated that the conquests were made by the Allies in order to liberate the native populations. That natives were abused in German Southwest Africa and German East Africa is indisputable. Similar abuses occurred in the African colonies of all the other states. Up to the time of the war and even during its early months the colonial administrative methods of Germany were praised by British experts. Its work in industrial education of the natives, in medical and scientific research, and in the maintenance of public health, was recognized by them as remarkable. A comparison of the penal laws instituted for the natives under German administration with those of other states having similar colonies shows that these laws were as humane as those of the others.

II

The fifth of the Fourteen Points announced on January 8, 1918, by President Wilson, and accepted by the belligerents as the basis of the peace treaty, was as follows:

> A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interest of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

The Peace Conference, in organizing itself, instituted, as its chief organ, a controlling committee of five composed of representatives of the five principal Allies—Great Britain, France, the United States, Italy, and Japan. This committee was called the "Council," or the "Supreme Council," of the Conference. The Allied and Associated Powers regarded themselves as the "Concert of Nations." The jurisdiction of the "Concert of Nations" was undefined, and was in fact extended, through the Council, to the doing of whatever the Council saw fit to do. The "Constitution" or "Covenant" adopted by the Conference was intended to continue and define the "Concert of Nations" and convert it into a permanent "League of Nations." President Wilson in his address to the Senate on July 10, 1919, on the occasion of his presentation of the peace treaty, spoke of the Conference as engaged in "the difficult work of arranging an all but universal adjustment of the world's affairs," and said:

> The Conference . . . was not to be ephemeral. The Concert of Nations was to continue, under a definite Covenant which had been agreed upon and which all were convinced was workable. They could go forward with confidence to make arrangements intended to be permanent.

The delegates of the United States to the Conference of the group of victor states to formulate terms of peace with the vanquished group were undoubtedly without constitutional authority to bring about or participate in a conversion of the Conference of victors into a universal government having supreme jurisdiction over all states; and if the peace treaty purports to legitimize and perpetuate such an act of the Conference, as it seems to do, it will be of no validity for this purpose, so far as the United States is concerned, even though the peace treaty were ratified by the Senate. Such an act would be an entering into a union with other states and would require a constitutional amendment or at least previous approval by act of Congress.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Covenant of the League of Nations, which was adopted by the Conference on April 28, 1919, and incorporated in the peace treaty, made no distribution of the German colonies. By Article XXII it made a provision for their administration by any states to which they should be distributed, specifying that the distribution should be "to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to undertake it," and requiring that any such distributee state should be held to be a mandatory on behalf of the League of Nations in administering the region, and should be under the surveillance of the League. This necessarily implied that the distribution was to be made by the League.

The Covenant permitted a self-governing dominion or colony to be a member of the League, and referred to the members of the League as "states." A self-governing colony or dominion, upon becoming a member of the League, is thereby undoubtedly recognized as an independent state. Inasmuch as Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, and India are parties to the Covenant, the adoption of it will thus make each of them independent and eligible to receive a mandate for administering any region, in any part of the world, which may be distributed to them by the League. The possibilities involved in this arrangement deserve careful consideration.

On May 5, 1919, a "provisional organization of the League of Nations" was made at Paris. In the published report it was said that "in adopting the rules for the temporary organization care was taken by the committee that nothing of a permanent nature should be done previous to the ratification of the peace treaty by the United States Senate."

During the period from April 24 until after May 6, 1919, Italy was not represented in the Conference or in the Council, the Italian delegates having withdrawn from the Conference. The "Council" was given the name of "The Council of Three." In the published account of its proceedings appears the following:

> The disposition to be made of the former German colonies was decided at the Peace Conference in Paris on May 6, 1919, by the Council of Three—M. Clemenceau, President Wilson and Mr. Lloyd George. . . . The official statement in detail is as follows:
>
> Togoland and Cameroon.—France and Great Britain shall make a joint recommendation to the League of Nations as to their fate.
>
> German East Africa.—The mandate shall be held by Great Britain.
>
> German Southwest Africa.—The mandate shall be held by the Union of South Africa.
>
> The German Samoan Islands.—The mandate shall be held by New Zealand.
>
> The other German Pacific possessions south of the Equator, excluding the German Samoan Islands and Nauru.—The mandate shall be held by Australia.
>
> Nauru (Pleasant Island).—The mandate shall be given to the British Empire.
>
> The German Pacific Islands north of the Equator.—The mandate shall be held by Japan.

On the next day—May 7, 1919—the delegates of the Allied and Associated Powers, assembled at Versailles, presented the peace treaty to the German delegates for signature.

On the day following, Belgium filed a protest with the Council against the distribution made by the Council of Three, in which it was said:

> In view of Belgium's important military operations in Africa, her sacrifices to insure the conquest of German East Africa, and the fact that her situation has given her rights on that continent, Belgium is unable to admit that German East Africa could be disposed of by agreements in which she had not participated.

The peace treaty was signed by Germany on June 28, 1919.

The statement above quoted, that the Council of Three, before the peace treaty was even presented to Germany, "decided" upon the disposition of the German colonies which was "to be made" is noticeable. It necessarily implies either that the Council of Three, acting as the Council of the Conference, or purporting to act as the Council of "the Concert of Nations," or as the Provisional Council of the League of Nations, was proposing a project of law, or a project of decree, to become a law or decree by action of the Conference in plenary session, or by action of the Conference as purporting to be "the Concert of Nations," or by action of the League of Nations when the League should be formed; or that the "Council of Three" was making a distribution of conquests to be carried into effect by agreement of the parties concerned.

Inasmuch as the distribution followed exactly the plan of conquest and also corresponded exactly with Great Britain's commitments to Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand, and with the understandings between Great Britain, France, and Japan, the act of the Council of Three was in fact a division of the spoils by the controlling victors, whatever may be the theory on which it is now sought to support it. Belgium's protest shows that it took this view.

It has recently been reported that Belgium's claims have been satisfied by Great Britain ceding to it a part of German East Africa—a proceeding which can be explained only on the theory that Great Britain at least considers itself to hold the full title and sovereignty of the regions allotted to it.

III

In the peace treaty the following disposition of the German colonies is made:

> Article 118. In territory outside her European frontiers as fixed by the present Treaty, Germany renounces all rights, titles and privileges whatever in or over territory which belonged to her or to her allies, and all rights, titles and privileges, whatever their origin, which she held as against the Allied and Associated Powers.
>
> Germany undertakes immediately to recognize and to conform to the measures which may be taken now or in the future by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, in agreement where necessary with third Powers, in order to carry the above stipulation into effect.
>
> In particular Germany declares her acceptance of the following Articles relating to certain special subjects.
>
> Article 119. Germany renounces in favor of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all her rights and titles over her oversea possessions.

Articles 120 to 127, inclusive, also relate to the German colonies. Sections 120 to 125, inclusive, have for their purpose the elimination of German property and interests, public and private, in these colonies. Article 126 requires Germany to observe the provisions of the Brussels African Act relating to the trade in arms and spirits in Middle Africa. Article 127 provides that "The native inhabitants of the former German oversea possessions shall be entitled to the diplomatic protection of the Governments exercising authority over those territories."

In Annex VII of Article 244, relating to the transfer of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the German submarine cables, it is provided as follows:

Germany renounces on her own behalf and on behalf of her nationals in favor of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all rights, titles and privileges of whatever nature in the submarine cables set out below, or in any portions thereof:

Yap-Shanghai, Yap-Guam, and Yap-Menado (Celebes): from Yap Island to Shanghai, from Yap Island to Guam Island, and from Yap Island to Menado.

If it were not for the action of the Council of Three, there could be no doubt that by the adoption of the peace treaty the title and sovereignty of all the German colonies would, under Article 119, be vested in the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, as tenants in common in equal shares, since by Article 119 Germany is required by all the Allied and Associated Powers to renounce all its oversea possessions in favor of the "Principal Allied and Associated Powers," and the five states named are by the peace treaty declared to be these "Principal" Powers.

Article 118, which requires Germany to "recognize and to conform to the measures which may be taken now or in the future by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, in agreement where necessary with third Powers, in order to carry the above stipulation [of renunciation] into effect," is exceedingly broad and far-reaching. It may be claimed that the expression "measures which may be taken now" has the effect of importing into the treaty and making final any action relating to the German colonies taken by the Peace Conference at any time prior to the date of the peace treaty, and thus recognizes and imports into the treaty the distribution made by the Council of Three. The argument would be, no doubt, that the action of the "Council of Three," was an act of partition made by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in expectation of receiving the title collectively by Article 119 of the peace treaty, and that they made this partition in advance in order to carry into effect that article. The expression, "measures which may be taken now" is so unusual and so difficult to understand in this connection unless it refers to the act of the Council of Three, that prudence demands that all doubt concerning what it means or implies should be set at rest before the United States is committed to it.

Were the United States to allow the peace treaty to be given such a construction that the distributive act of the "Council of Three" would be imported into it, it would give its consent to an act which it was not within the constitutional power of the representatives of the United States to do and which would violate its professed plan, accepted by the belligerents, that there should be a "free, open-minded and impartial adjustment of all colonial claims."

The distribution was not free or open-minded, being made in pursuance of secret commitments and understandings, and without reference to the full Conference. If the Covenant permits the British dominions and India to be at the same time members of the League of Nations as independent states, with full voting powers and the power to be mandatories of the League, and at the same time allows them to be parts of the British Empire in subordination to Great Britain, or federal states in a British Commonwealth under Great Britain as presiding and commanding head, the distribution was not impartial; for by it the British Empire received nearly all that there was to be distributed.

If Japan acquires permanently the islands distributed to it, it will be located between the United States and the whole Orient; its insular possessions will surround the Philippines and Guam; its influence will be extended to a line in the Pacific hundreds of miles nearer the United States; it will command Hawaii, the Panama Canal, and the whole Pacific Coast. In case a properly organized League of Nations should decide that it would be fair to dispose of all Germany's colonies and give Germany no mandate whatever, and in case backward regions not its colonies should be allotted to the various members of the League, the proper mandatory for the Pacific Islands north of the equator would unquestionably be the United States. Nothing should be allowed to check the development of the Philippines along the lines the United States has wisely laid out and successfully followed. No self-denying professions made in its behalf can properly be allowed to interfere with any action having for its object the prevention of the present distribution from becoming permanent. It is the first duty of a state to protect itself and its wards.

British Imperialists and German Colonial Policy

Before the War

IN view of the reasons alleged for retaining the German colonies under Allied control, and the disposition made of them by the Council of Three, it is interesting to note the pre-war attitude of British experts toward German colonial administration. *United Empire,* from which a number of the following extracts are taken, is the official journal of the Royal Colonial Institute, composed of the leading British experts in colonial affairs. In an article on German Colonial Education, appearing in the issue of January, 1911, Louis Hamilton, the principal writer on the German colonies for *United Empire,* in discussing the three German Institutes for colonial education, said:

. . . What is evident is that in education of the better class of colonists Germany is ahead of all countries, as she always is in matters educational. If we Britishers, with our vast Empire, would only remember what our own opportunities for colonial education are, we might begin to turn over a new leaf. Let us not forget that what Germany is today she owes to a great extent to a superior education in everything. Today is not tomorrow. There are a good many pages in history, especially colonial history, that are unwrit. The maps of Africa and South America particularly have not been finally "colored," though we may close our eyes to this fact, but we of this generation have seen a good many changes in the atlas. As far as colonial education of the better-class emigrant goes—*i.e.* the official, the military man, and the scientist—Germany has a complete apparatus. She has the education and not the colonies; we have the colonies and not the education. . . .

The same writer, in an article on The German Colony in China (*United Empire,* September, 1912), said of German administration in Kiaochow:

. . . We can learn much from what Germany is doing quietly and unostentatiously in China. Her introduction of order, health, system, education, and afforestation are respect-compelling factors which speak eloquently to awakening China of a country which to her is a new world-power risen out of obscurity. She no longer looks upon Kiaochow as a thorn in her side, but as a sound spot, from which the health-giving example of Occidental civilization radiates through the Celestial Empire. . . .

. . . Perhaps the greatest work the Germans are doing is afforestation. Starting in the very streets of Tsingtao, which are now planted with pleasant trees, surrounding the neat villas

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and massive public buildings with parks and shady gardens, the green health- and moisture-bringing woods are spreading over the neighborhood and into the hinterland. Those who have been to China know how the Chinese have sinned in their irrational destruction of forests, and can appreciate the educational value to the country of Germany's afforestation policy which is, in fact, turning the once treeless and nude Protectorate territory into a pleasantly wooded country. But ornament takes a second place, utility the first. The woods already supply the mines with an ever-increasing stock of props and other mining timber, all of which had formerly to be imported. Some 5,000 trees, the same number of shrubs, and 500,000 plants are given away annually by the authorities to the native and European population. The acacia has proved to be the best-fitted tree for the Protectorate, and a private Chinese firm has begun planting no fewer than 600,000 of these trees, the wood of which will finally be employed in the mines. Nor is the work of afforestation limited to timber trees, but extends to the planting of orchards. . . .

The following extracts are from an article by Mr. Hamilton, in the issue of December, 1912, on The German Colonies, 1910-11:

. . . The year under discussion has been one of general prosperity. With the exception of Togo, health conditions have been excellent. The death rate in Cameroon is on the decrease, both amongst the native and white population, and most energetic and heroic steps are being taken to suppress sleeping-sickness wherever it appears. . . .

Much progress has been made, especially in Southwest Africa, East Africa, Togo, and Samoa in surveying and mapping. The Dutch-German frontier commission in New Guinea has demonstrated that an enormous amount of exploration work is necessary in that country. A glance at German colonial maps must make a self-respecting Britisher blush. It would be difficult to speak in terms of exaggerated praise of the excellent results achieved in this most important factor in the development of colonies. The Germans are willing to learn where they can from us: let us be equally open-minded and learn where we can from them.

The German missions are doing good work—their schools instruct 50,000 natives. Recognizing the danger of advancing Mohammedanism in East Africa the missionaries have "mobilized" to such an extent that they now stand next in number to the planters and farmers. . . .

To the issue of July, 1913, Mr. Hamilton contributed an article on The German Colonies, 1911-12, from which we quote the following statements:

. . . In Southwest Africa advance has been made along the road to self-government by conferring the right of land possession on local bodies. There has been a general tendency throughout the colonies to employ natives for minor official work; the results obtained have been satisfactory, the effect on the native being to spur on his energy and desire to acquire European culture. . . .

Wherever the German may be, the schoolmaster is abroad. With the missionaries, the colonial governments have developed education to quite an astonishing extent. The number of native children attending schools is rapidly on the increase, and this is chiefly due to the peaceful and harmonious manner in which the missions and the administration have supported one another's efforts. . . .

The total white population [in East Africa] actively engaged was 3,239, and the number of natives was computed at 7,500,000.

The strides which medical activity and hygiene are making is best shown by the fact that over half a million natives were vaccinated. In the years 1909-1910 and 1911 nearly 2,000,000 were vaccinated. The persistent fight against sleeping sickness is being continued. Whole tribes have been moved from infected areas. . . .

The colony of Cameroon is in an increasing state of prosperity. Education is on the upward grade. . . .

. . . During the upheavals in China in 1911-1912 some 12,000 Chinese migrated to Tsingtao, where they felt they would meet with a stable government and order. . . .

At a meeting of The Royal Colonial Institute on Tuesday, January 13, 1914, presided over by Viscount Milner, former High Commissioner for South Africa, Professor Bonn, of Munich University, read a paper on German Colonial Policy. The record of the meeting is to be found in *United Empire* of February, 1914. In introducing the speaker, Viscount Milner said:

I have great pleasure in introducing to you Professor Bonn, of Munich, a Director of the great commercial University in that same city, who has made a special journey to this country in order to address us on the subject of German Colonial Policy. I think I shall express the feelings of all present when I say that we greatly appreciate the fact that, busy man as he is, and holding that high position in the educational system in his own country, he should have made the considerable sacrifice of time involved in a journey to London, in order to put his views before us in person. I can assure him that the respect with which we should in any case have received opinions proceeding from so high an authority is greatly enhanced by the compliment which we feel is paid to the Royal Colonial Institute by his presence here tonight. It is impossible to exaggerate the magnitude of the subject of his address, its importance or its interest, especially to members of a Society such as this. Great Britain has had a long and very diversified experience as a colonizing country. Germany is a comparatively newcomer in the colonial field, but, having entered, she has thrown herself into the unfamiliar task with characteristic thoroughness and energy. It would be a great mistake to think that we have nothing to learn from her experience in that field, as she, admittedly, has much to learn—something, at any rate—from our long history as a colonizing people. . . .

We quote the following statements from Dr. Bonn's address:

. . . The framework of society [Southwest Africa] is European; very little land is in the hands of the natives. Out of 23,227 grown-up natives, only 1,027 own farms or cattle (most of them being half-castes); the rest are workers for their white masters. . . . We rule a colonial empire five times as big as Germany with about 14,000,000 natives. We rule them not always very wisely, and not yet very effectively everywhere; but we rule them without very great effort. We hold our dependencies with a force of 2,400 white soldiers, and 744 white policemen, and about 9,000 colored soldiers and policemen. Almost three-quarters of that white force are quartered in Southwest Africa. Nor have we spent much money on the maintenance and development of our possessions. . . . It goes without saying that 1,700 white officials of all sorts and ranks, half of them again in Southwest Africa, cannot rule different colonies as efficiently as we rule at home. But there are ample signs of a growing strength of the administration everywhere. There is a yearly increase, for instance, in the number of native criminals brought to justice, which, let us hope, is not so much due to increased perversity as to the growing strength of the administration. As taxpaying is the best test of peaceful subjugation, the ever increasing returns of the hut-tax (it nearly doubled in the Cameroons in the last four years) is a proof of increased administrative efficiency. . . .

We have settled about 24,000 white people. There were 7,523 ten years ago. We have built cities which are healthy and habitable. We have laid out farms and planted villages reproducing in some districts the chief features of life at home. We have started plantations which are profitable to their owners. Apart from the 1,200 farms in South Africa, there are about 1,000 plantations owned by Europeans, run by about 1,300 white owners and overseers, employing a labor force of about 90,000 natives. We have done a certain amount in native administra-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion—though here, more than anywhere else, we are beginners—by spreading peace and sanitation, by teaching the natives in schools and in agriculture. But apart from Southwest Africa, where we solved the native problem by smashing tribal life and by creating a scarcity of labor, we are only just now beginning to understand it. . . .

We started, last not least, with a wrong conception of colonial possibilities. We wanted to concentrate on Africa the emigrants we were losing at the beginning of our colonial enterprise. We wanted to build up on African soil a new Germany and create daughter-states as you have done in Australia and in Canada. We carried this idea to its bitter end. We tried it in Southwest Africa and produced a huge native rising causing the loss of much treasure and many lives. We tried to assume to ourselves the functions of Providence, and we tried to exterminate a native race, whom our lack of wisdom had goaded to rebellion. We succeeded in breaking up the native tribes, but we have not yet succeeded in creating a new Germany. Such as it is, Southwest Africa, which has been mainly responsible for most of our colonial expenditure, is quite as much distinct from Germany as the Cape Colony is from Australia. We are the rulers and we are the owners, but even now we are building on a native population. And as what is left over of the native tribes is not sufficient for development work, we have had to import natives not only from our own tropical colonies, but from Cape Colony as well. We have spent more money and more energy on Southwest Africa than all other colonies taken together. Though we hope that we have laid solid foundations at last for its future development, our own action has shown the futility of our own ideals.

The causes alluded to must needs have had a retarding effect on our colonial development. They are, if I am not greatly mistaken, rapidly disappearing. The great economic transition of Germany is going on apace. Though Germany must go on developing, she has far more means at her disposal than she ever had. She has available capital—she has lent about £1,000,000,000 to foreign countries. She is evolving an enterprising, adventurous, and well-to-do upper class. She is gathering experience and she is laying down clearly the future lines of a sober colonial policy. Germany wants supplies for her people, and raw material for her mills. She wants lands, where she can grow them, and markets from which she cannot be excluded. She finds them ready at hands in her colonies. They cry out for European enterprise and European capital. But they do not want European emigrants. Even if Germany had them to spare, she could not direct them to Africa. This truth is acknowledged today by most responsible people. There are still some dreamers—they were rather noisy during the Morocco crisis—who wanted to plant a new German nation amongst numerous, but as they presumed extremely friendly, Moroccan tribes, who are supposed to want nothing better than to be ousted from their lands by German infidels. But their policy did not prevail and cannot prevail. By taking from France a broad strip of admittedly tropical country (I am not going to discuss its value), *the German Government have shown plainly enough that their ideal of colonization is not a policy of settlement, but one of commercial exploitation.** The fact that a Colonial Secretary who had advocated the impossible policy of white settlements in Africa with unflinching courage sent in his resignation before the bargain was concluded, can be looked upon as a dramatic end of the fight between two schools of colonial ideas. . . .

. . . the question of German colonial policy is a question of native policy. We may discard it in some of our island possessions—it is the question everywhere else. It is not merely a question how are we to rule them? for where they are really numerous, we scarcely rule them today. It is what we are going to do with them when we have the power to shape their fate. We want them to be as numerous as possible, and as skilful and as intelligent as we can make them. For only their numbers and their industry can make our Colonial Empire as useful and as necessary as it ought to be.

Owing to the different structure of our colonies, the task will be different in each of the above mentioned groups. In the Cameroons and in Togo, we are ruling native states and tribes by a bureaucracy somewhat on the lines of the Indian bureaucracy. In East Africa we are creating a mixed colony, planting fragments of a white society amongst dense African masses. In Southwest Africa, we have created a kind of a manorial system with a European lord of the manor and an African serf. Each type has its advantages, each has its drawbacks. Where you rule a native dependency by European civil servants, you can easily avoid class frictions and social upheavals. You will not have many difficulties in adjusting the relation of the colony to the mother country. You can go slowly and warily. You can go on ruling with a minimum of effort, but you probably will have a slow development. You have not [got?] to conciliate the interests of the planter with the interests of the native. You can rule according to your conscience and you can rule the native for his benefit. But, whatever you will do, you will rule him as a foreigner and you will always rule him, however just your government may be, by the point of the sword. . . .

After Professor Bonn's address, Sir Charles Lucas, one of the foremost British authorities on colonial affairs, said:

I would like to thank Professor Bonn, as you would all like to thank him, for his interesting address. I have been wondering how many English Professors would take the trouble, in the dead of winter, to go from London to Munich, and how many, when they got there, would be able to deliver a lecture in German as good as the English of our Professor. He has told us of German colonial policy. Do you realize that that is a work of thirty years only? It is a wonderful work of a great people. The Germans, we have been told, have been at a disadvantage, because they came into overseas work when the pick of the world had been taken up; but they have had great advantages also. Coming late in the day, they have profited by the mistakes of other peoples, and there is nothing so valuable and nothing so exhilarating as to study the mistakes of elders. Again, as a scientific people, they have come to this work at a time when the forces of science have been developed. The English, the French, and the Dutch blundered along before the age of steam and electricity, but the most scientific nation in the world has taken up the work at a time when scientific forces have begun to be strongest. They have had other advantages. Party Government does not play such a part in Germany as in England. Party Government means *ex parte* statements. I am, in a humble way, a student of colonial history. I do not hesitate to say that the greatest curse to the British Empire through the centuries has been this Party Government. The Germans have had one other advantage. They are a people who know their own mind, and, being good linguists, they have the habit of knowing other people's minds also. We are not such good linguists, and we do not study other people's minds. It is only occasionally that we know our own. . . .

An article on The German Colonies in 1912-13, by Louis Hamilton, appeared in *United Empire* of June, 1914. From this article we quote the following:

This is now the fifth annual review of the German colonies published by *United Empire*. A perusal of these five reports must convince the unprejudiced observer that the German colonies have entered upon a period of increasing prosperity, and that the work undertaken by the mother country has aimed at opening up the colonies, establishing order and peace, improving the conditions of the native, and, in short, setting them on their feet, and giving them a chance to continue along the path of prosperity that is being prepared for them. Before entering upon a general survey of the year under discussion, it will not be out of place to consider the most significant phenomenon of German colonial policy which is at present very much in

*Italics in the original.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evidence, and is bound to have far-reaching effects throughout those parts of Africa populated by blacks. This is a policy that may be termed "Protection of the Native." Effectively to carry out this laudable object, a society has recently been formed in Berlin under the leadership of such men as Professor D. Westermann, Ernst Vohsen, and Christian v. Bornhaupt. The organ of the society is the *Koloniale Rundschau,* which is by far the most important colonial journal in Germany, and, under Professor Westermann's able editorship, has always taken a prominent part in all negrophil movements. . . .

Sir H. H. Johnston, the great authority on Africa, writing in *The Edinburgh Review* of October, 1914, said of German colonial administration:

What account has Germany to give of her stewardship of her thirty years as a Colonial Power? On the whole a good one. International science has been greatly the gainer by the presence of Germany as a ruler or administrator in Africa, Oceania, China, and the Turkish Empire. Look at the magnificently furnished German museums of ethnology and natural history; consider the German contributions to philology, to the study of tropical diseases, to economic botany, chemistry, paleontology, history, and archeology. Germany has effectively abolished the deeply rooted slave-trade in East Africa and in the Cameroon hinterland. Her treatment of the native races in some parts of Africa has been harsh, but on the whole—when unprejudiced truth is told—the natives are the better in the long run for the incoming of the Germans. In Southwest Africa the Negro population has diminished through the long-drawn out wars with the white rulers; but it must be remembered when the Germans first came on the scene in 1884 the Hottentots were exterminating the Bantu Negroes, yet perishing themselves from alcohol, small-pox, syphilis, and starvation due to disappearance of the big game. Of late years the native population in Southwest Africa has been on the increase. In East Africa thirty years of German rule has probably doubled the Negro population. Germany has constructed a thousand miles of railroad in East Africa, 1,880 miles in Southwest Africa, 128 miles in Togoland, 149 miles in the Cameroon, and 272 miles in Kiaochow (Eastern China). In the Near East she has built the famous Bagdad railway from Konieh nearly to Skanderūn and Aleppo and, in patches, onwards towards Bagdad (some 1,200 miles in all). Her future policy in Turkey might have tended to secure unfair preference for German trade; yet it is only fair to remember that in the territories actually under German sway she has preserved the free trade principle. . . .

During the War

The marked change wrought by the war in the British imperialist attitude toward German colonial administration is illustrated by the following extracts from the British official *Report on the Natives of South-West Africa and their Treatment by Germany,* issued in August, 1918. We quote first from the preface, written by E. H. M. Gorges, the official British administrator of the colony:

. . . The time available for the collection of material for incorporation into this report and for the careful collation of that material has been brief; but, notwithstanding, a large amount of evidence is presented which contains irrefutable proofs of the gross ineptitude with which Germany entered upon her scheme of colonizing this territory, of the callous indifference with which she treated the guaranteed rights of the native peoples established here, and of the cruelties to which she subjected those peoples when the burden became too heavy and they attempted to assert their rights. . . .

As a colonist, the German in Southwest Africa, speaking generally, has been a failure. He has never shown the slightest disposition to learn the natives' point of view, to adapt his ideas to the long-established customs and habits of the people, or to fall in with the ways of the country. When he arrived here he found the natives both rich and comparatively numerous. His sole object seemed, as soon as he felt strong enough, to take the fullest advantage possible of the simplicity of these people, and despoil them utterly. When the process did not, by means of the system of trading that sprang up, which in itself was often but a thinly disguised form of chicanery and knavery, go quickly enough, rapine, murder, and lust were given full play with the disastrous results of which we see evidences every day around us. . . .

Enough should be found in this report to convince the most confirmed sceptic of the unsuitability of the Germans to control natives, and also to show him what can be expected if the unfortunate natives of this part of Africa are ever again handed back to the former régime. . . .

Chapter III, which we reprint below, is entitled *Germany's Declared Policy in regard to the Native Races.* It will be noted that the events discussed and the documents cited antedate by several years the extracts from *United Empire,* quoted above.

In the year 1884, shortly after Prince Bismarck had cabled the Emperor's blessing and the protection of Germany to the merchant Luderitz at Angra Pequena, another event of great importance took place. In November of that year Prince Bismarck convened the famous Berlin-Congo Conference, which sat at Berlin until February, 1885. Under Bismarck's guidance the Conference declared all equatorial Africa to be a kind of free trade area, granted France a large slice of the lower Congo, and in addition to other decisions, made it the duty of all Colonial Powers to come to an agreement with one another on the occasion of fresh aggrandizements. "English colonial monopoly," states a German writer, "was thereby broken and a juster distribution of colonial possessions was at all events inaugurated."

The Conference went further, and before breaking up the conferring Powers solemnly and emphatically pledged themselves and placed on record their recognition of the sacred duty

(1) Of preserving the aboriginal races of Africa,

(2) Of watching over their interests,

(3) Of cultivating their moral and material advancement and development.

In July, 1890, Germany was again very prominent at the Anti-Slavery Conference in Brussels, when it was placed on record by solemn pledge and resolution that it was the emphatic desire of the conferring Powers effectively to protect the native races of Africa from oppression and slavery.

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, knowing what Germany's declared and avowed native policy was, that the statesmen and people of Great Britain had no hesitation in welcoming that Power into the arena of world colonization as a co-partner in the great work of civilizing and uplifting the heathen races of the earth. It was apparently in this spirit and on those pledged assurances at Berlin and Brussels that Great Britain allowed Germany to annex the 322,450 square miles of territory in Southwest Africa, and by a stroke of the pen placed the Ovambos, Hereros, Damaras, Hottentots, Bastards, and Bushmen of that vast land under the guardianship and control of the German Emperor.

Referring to this event a German historian writes:

In consideration of the increasing expansion of German dominion, the first thing needful seemed to be a more definite determination of the German and English spheres of influence, so as to secure a firmer foundation for the civilizing labors of the two nations. With this object, the much discussed Anglo-German Agreement was concluded, which extended to Africa and also brought the island of Heligoland, off the German coast, into possession of Germany. The great value of this acquisition to the German Fleet and to the defence of the mouths of the Elbe, Weser, and Jade is now universally recognized. (*Historian's History of the World:* Vol. XV., page 556).

After annexation had become an accomplished fact and Ger-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man statesmen had done their work, true German opinion began to reveal itself and, not many years after annexation, the real German policy was made horribly manifest to the unfortunate natives of Southwest Africa.

Commenting on this policy, the effects of which had never been so strongly evidenced as just after the second and last Herero rebellion in 1904, Dr. Paul Rohrbach, the accepted and candid oracle of German colonial policy (who in 1890 was a highly placed official in the German Colonial Office), writes as follows:

> The decision to colonize in Southwest Africa could after all mean nothing else but this, namely, that the native tribes would have to give up their lands on which they had previously grazed their stock in order that the white man might have the land for the grazing of his stock.

When this attitude is questioned from the moral law standpoint, the answer is that for nations of the "Kultur-position" of the South African natives, the loss of their free national barbarism and their development into a class of laborers in service of and dependent on the white people is primarily a "law of existence" in the highest degree.

It is applicable to a nation in the same way as to the individual, that the right of existence is justified primarily in the degree that such existence is useful for progress and general development.

By no arguments whatsoever can it be shown that the preservation of any degree of national independence, national property, and political organization by the races of Southwest Africa, would be of a greater or even of an equal advantage for the development of mankind in general or of the German people in particular, than the making of such races serviceable in the enjoyment of their former possessions by the white races. (*Deutsche Kolonialwirtschaft*, page 286.)

Books of the Week

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Burnett-Smith, A. As Others See Her. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25.—Cannan, Gilbert. The Anatomy of Society. Dutton. $2.—Mackenzie, W. Roy. The Quest of the Ballad. Princeton University Press. $2.—Maurice, Arthur Bartlett. The Paris of the Novelists. Doubleday, Page. $2.50.—Mencken, H. L. Prejudices: First Series. Knopf. $2.—Raleigh, Sir Walter. Shakespeare and England. British Academy Annual Shakespeare Lecture, 1918. Oxford University Press.—Smith, C. Alphonso. New Words Self-Defined. Doubleday, Page. $1.25.—Stephens, Winifred. The France I Know. Dutton.—Warner, Frances Lester. Endicott and I. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25.—Williams, Harold. Modern English Writers. Knopf. $5.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Lawrence F. Impressions of Theodore Roosevelt. Doubleday, Page. $3.—Anonymous. Madeleine: An Autobiography. Harpers. $2.—Fiske, Bradley A. From Midshipman to Rear-Admiral. Century. $6.—Fletcher, C. R. L., and Emery Walker. Historical Portraits, 1700-1850, Volumes 3 and 4. Oxford: Clarendon Press.—Keith, Arthur Berriedale. The Belgian Congo and the Berlin Act. Oxford: Clarendon Press.—John McCormack: His Own Life Story. Transcribed by Pierre V. R. Key. Small, Maynard. $3.—Massenet, Jules. My Recollections. Translated by H. Villiers Barnett. Small, Maynard. $3.—Morton, Richard L. The Negro in Virginia Politics, 1865-1902. Publications of the University of Virginia. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.—Saint-Saëns, Camille. Musical Memories. Small, Maynard. $3.—Tucker, William Jewett. My Generation. Houghton Mifflin. $4.

POETRY AND DRAMA

Bridges, Robert. Britannia Victrix. Oxford University Press.—Bunker, John. Shining Fields and Dark Towers. Lane. $1.25.—Harvitt, Helene (editor). Molière's L'Ecole des Femmes. Oxford University Press.—Hutton, H. L. (editor). Victor Hugo's Ruy Blas. Oxford: Clarendon Press.—Masefield, John. Reynard the Fox, or The Ghost Heath Run. Macmillan. $1.60.—Rice, Cale Young. Shadowy Thresholds. Century.—Selected Poems of Verner von Heidenstam, Sweden's Laureate. Translated by Charles Wharton Stork. Yale University Press. $1.35.—Semeonoff, A. E., and H. J. W. Tillyard. Russian Poetry Reader. Dutton.—Tarkington, Booth, and Harry Leon Wilson. The Gibson Upright. Doubleday, Page. $1.25.—Tietjens, Eunice. Profiles from China. Knopf. $1.25.—French, Herbert. Napoleon. Oxford University Press.—Walker, Stuart. More Portmanteau Plays. Cincinnati: Stewart & Kidd. $1.75.

MISCELLANEOUS

Waldron, William H. Army Physical Training. Holt. $1.50.

FICTION

Bartley, Nalbro. A Woman's Woman. Small, Maynard. $1.75.—Blythe, Samuel G. Hunkins. Doran. $1.75.—Brown, Alice. The Black Drop. Macmillan. $2.—Fuller, Henry B. Bertram Cope's Year. Chicago: Ralph Fletcher Seymour. $1.75.—Henry, O. Waifs and Strays. Doubleday, Page.—Hergesheimer, Joseph. The Lay Anthony. New edition. Knopf.—Lewis, Sinclair. Free Air. Harcourt, Brace & Howe.—Patterson, Marjorie. A Woman's Man. Doran. $1.60.—Richardson, Dorothy M. Backwater. Knopf. $1.75.—Richardson, Dorothy M. Honeycomb. Knopf. $1.75.—Richardson, Dorothy M. Pointed Roofs. Knopf. $1.75.—Witwer, H. C. Alex the Great. Small, Maynard. $1.75.—Worts, George F. Peter the Brazen. Lippincott. $1.50.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Barthou, L. Le Traité de Paix. Paris: Bibliotheque-Charpentier. $1.10.—Clark, Francis E. Our Italian Fellow Citizens. Small, Maynard. $1.50.—Coolidge, Calvin. Have Faith in Massachusetts. Houghton Mifflin. $1.50.—Harrison, Frederic. On Jurisprudence and the Conflict of Laws. Oxford: Clarendon Press.—MacIver, R. M. Labor in the Changing World. Dutton. $2.—Milhaud, Edgard. Plus Jamais! Paris: Editions Georges Crès & Co. $1.65.—Weber, Gustavus A. Organized Efforts for the Improvement of Methods of Administration in the United States. Appleton. $2.75.

THE WAR

Collins, Joseph. My Italian Year. Scribners. $2.50.

ART AND ARCHEOLOGY

Anderson, Paul L. The Fine Art of Photography. Lippincott. $3.—Holme, Geoffrey (Editor). Early English Water-Color Drawings. The Studio.—Lutz, Henry F. Selected Sumerian and Babylonian Texts. Publications of the University Museum, Philadelphia.—Robinson, Albert G. Old New England Doorways. Scribners. $3.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Brown, Charles Reynolds. Yale Talks. Yale University Press. $1.—Payot, Jules. Le Travail Intellectuel. Paris: Felix Alcan. $1.40.—Smyth, Newman, and Williston Walker (editors). Approaches Towards Church Unity. Yale University Press. $1.25.—Walter, H. A. The Religious Life of India: The Ahmadiya Movement. Oxford University Press.

SCIENCE

Smithsonian Meteorological Tables. Fourth Revised Edition. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

TRAVEL AND DESCRIPTION

Faure, Gabriel. Wanderings in Italy. Houghton Mifflin. $2.50.—Wade, Sir Charles G. Australia: Problems and Prospects. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED